


IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

BY BARON
VON TAUBE



IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

BY BARON VON TAUBE



STEPHEN SWIFT
AND COMPANY LIMITED
TEN JOHN STREET
ADELPHI MCMXII

E 168
T 2

PRINTED BY
THE LONDON AND NORWICH PRESS, LIMITED
LONDON AND NORWICH

TO THE
ASSOCIATED

INTRODUCTORY

MY DEAR X,

You ask me if I will write a series of articles on the United States, giving the American point of view in reply to a number of hard hits at poor Uncle Sam, which you kindly cite as instances of the criticisms popularly prevailing in England.

My reply is an emphatic yes. I give it so much the more willingly, since, outside of the community of racial traits in body and mind clearly demonstrated in many man to man stage encounters in wild mining camps and cattle ranches, the political future may easily bring issues to the front which the two cousins must face together if the Anglo-Saxon race is to remain the Top-Dog.

The episodes of the Boston Tea Party, Valley Forge, the Christmas with the Hessians at Trenton, and even New Orleans, belong to-day as much to traditional lore as the Spanish Main, Sir Walter Raleigh, or Francis Drake ; they are the common property of both cousins, equally dear to each of

INTRODUCTORY

them as showing that on both sides of the pond personal valour, strength of character, and the spirit of "Never say die" were as characteristic of the past as we hope they are of the present. In fact the earliest traditions of the United States, well kept and cherished in the land of Uncle Sam, are characteristically English—all alive with the old spirit of England. Washington's hatchet, "Never give up the ship" of Paul Jones, or the "Let us have some more rebellion" of Patrick Henry, represent a national psychology, and are of as much educational value to-day as they were when they were uttered. The question almost arises: which of the cousins has done the most with his share of the joint inheritance from their common ancestor? I content myself for the moment with the reminder that there is more elbow room in the United States and far better chances to "let the mare go!"

During the time, however, that the two cousins have been busy indulging in a free and hearty criticism of each other's shortcomings, as to "insular narrowmindedness, stiffness, and frigid correctness, killing the human in man" on the one side; and, on the other, "anything you

INTRODUCTORY

please, but certainly not a gentleman," the world has progressed at a rather rapid pace. The desintegrating, revolutionary wave of Internationalism has shaken some of the oldest empires to their foundations, and, as a natural result, left a large number of new national centres consolidated and claiming to-day a world recognition, generally on an economic basis. Further, the old issue between the traditional Anglo-Saxon Individualism and the now reviving principle of disciplined Collectivism, on the decision of which the world's future depends, is nearing its final and desperate conflict. A terrible struggle, in fact, looms ahead, in which the vital interests of both cousins will oblige them to stand side by side. As, however, in your indictment, poor Uncle Sam stands in the dock accused as well of picking pockets as of misdeeds deserving the New York electric easy chair, or the Baily ribbon of distinction, I propose to proceed somewhat systematically with my apologia, separating the merely individual from the national, subdividing the national as referring to a number of special functions and stages of development of the group found indispensable in a national existence.

INTRODUCTORY

My contention is that both cousins have to learn a great deal from each other. Insight into each other's life-cards can only be of the greatest benefit to them, considering the importance of their hearty mutual understanding. It is a case where ignorance is more likely to create danger and loss than the proverbial bliss.

Yours faithfully,

G. v. TAUBE.

POPULAR INDICTMENTS AGAINST THE CITIZEN OF UNCLE SAM'S REALM

I. Americans worship only money and what can be bought by or reckoned in money.—*Answer* : Chapter III.

II. Their sole contribution to the world's civilization is a number of engineering and mechanical devices. Even in machinery they do not, however, excel, since it is invariably made badly. American machinery never lasts : it is so made as to come to an early scrap heap.—*Answer* : Chapter III.

III. Their reputed business capacity is a myth. Really they have only the forms of business ; they are slower and more unbusinesslike than any other people.—*Answer* : Chapter IV.

IV. American education is superficial and vulgar. It does not produce scholars or men of taste, but only quaint learned men and vulgarians.—*Answer* : Chapter V.

V. American politics are more corrupt than any the world has known.—*Answer* : Chapter VI.

POPULAR INDICTMENTS

VI. American public servants are, like Russian officials, open to bribery without exception.—

Answer : Chapter VII.

VII. American statesmen are almost invariably without education and self-made.—*Answer* : Chapter VIII.

VIII. American foreign politics are slippery.—*Answer* : Chapter VIII.

IX. Their public life is vulgar and hysterical.—*Answer* : Chapter VIII.

X. Their treatment of the negro is more brutal than the Roman and Greek slavery.—*Answer* : Chapter IX.

XI. The Americans are de-civilized.—*Answer* : Chapter X.

XII. They have no manners whatever.—*Answer* : Chapter X.

XIII. America has no high society. Wealthy persons live in hotels ; the moderately rich in wretched flats.—*Answer* : Chapter XI.

XIV. American women are silly, sexless, and expensive.—*Answer* : Chapter XII.

XV. American religion is represented by Sankey and Moody, or Torrey and Alexander.—*Answer* : Chapter XIV.

POPULAR INDICTMENTS

XVI. American morality is puritanical in profession, but licentious in fact. Marriages are but a matter of form, and men as well as women unchaste.—*Answer* : Chapter XV.

XVII. While professing to despise, they secretly admire, European and especially English aristocracy. They will pay anything for an English title, an English education, an English heirloom, an English work of art, etc.—*Answer* : Chapter XVI.

XVIII. But they appreciate none of these things except enviously.—*Answer* : Chapter XVI.

XIX. America's national characteristics are those of weakness, being bully, bounce, brag and bluster.—*Answer* : Chapter XVII.

XX. American children are spoilt brats, being mostly nervous, hysterical and ill-mannered —*Answer* : Chapter XVIII.

XXI. Jonathan, while very sentimental, is without bowels.—*Answer* : Chapter XVIII.

XXII. Americans have no appreciation of personality. All are potentially equal, and consequently there is only insolence among the inferior.—*Answer* : Chapter XIX.

XXIII. They bully negroes to vent their spleen

POPULAR INDICTMENTS

for being bullied by Europeans.—*Answer* : Chapter XIX.

XXIV. Americans are inhospitable.—*Answer* : Chapter XIX.

XXV. Americans eat greedily, drink to excess, and die of dyspepsia.—*Answer* : Chapter XIX.

XXVI. An American abroad is ashamed of his country ; he likes nothing better than to be mistaken for an Englishman.—*Answer* : Chapter XX.

XXVII. The best Americans live in Europe.—*Answer* : Chapter XX.

XXVIII. They have produced no literature, art, music, architecture, poetry, or drama.—*Answer* : Chapter XXI.

XXIX. American wit and humour are, at best, only a trick of incongruous imagination.—*Answer* : Chapter XXI.

XXX. They do not speak English, but a sort of uncouth slang.—*Answer* : Chapter XXI.

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

CHAPTER I

ARGUING not long ago against my matter-of-fact, purely objective way of treating a subject, a literary friend of mine declared rationalism to be the real danger of the day, and closed his harangue with the potent statement that "without visions we were bound to perish." Against this I maintained that without a full allowance of popularly handled rationalism, our visions were bound to become mere "Pipe Dreams"—American slang for the visions of the opium smoker—the empty pursuit of æsthetic form, careless of the substance contained therein.

This small incident is so representative of the way I intend to treat my subject, that I consider it but square to the reader to mention it; not as a suggestion of opposition to the ideal or and even to the poetic, but merely as a distinct affirmation that, "across the pond," we are accustomed to investigate closely whether any ideal has sufficiently

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

solid legs to stand upon. Equally are we ready to find the truly poetic in unadulterated reality.

In fact, in the present age of the energetic revaluation of old values, irrespective of their antiquity and the popularity they once enjoyed, it is only the standard of actualities that can pass unchallenged. On this foundation and on no other I intend to build my argument.

However, as, when dealing with another country, nobody would dream of suspecting high artistic notions in a German Bauer, or pacific tendencies in a uniformed Prussian Junker, or expect profound economic science from a French *Marchand de la halle centrale*, or, again, would be likely to find correct notions about the world's market in a Bavarian poetical genius, it is but fair similarly to classify the American people, when making their country answer for their various shortcomings. Equally is it necessary that the true meaning of Americanism as a national doctrine should be investigated, and the bona-fide citizenship of the United States established, before proceeding any further.

This is the more important, as the so commonly accepted standard of nationality—namely, con-

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

sanguinity—would be hardly applicable to America in view of the enormous variety of national and racial types that enter within the compound of the country's population. But the maintenance of the national colonial traditions and the national use of the English language, now constitutionally established, tend to prove that, though numerically inferior, the Anglo-Saxon element originally prevailed sufficiently over the others to take a lead from the start, and to maintain it by giving its own stamp of free individuality to the whole country. Hence the first question : who is to be considered genuine American ?

McAllister—once the official Major Domo and organizer of the glorious Four Hundred—would answer : at least four generations in the country are necessary to the creation of a pure American ; and he would possibly refer us to the five *biblical* generations for a foundation of his argument. But this could only apply to the descending and not to the progressing evolutionary scale. In fact five generations of artificiality and hothouse culture suffice to neutralize even a strong and healthy family strain, reducing it to the nature and consistency of the international, refined, social

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

article—an article that is as acceptable as it is vacuous. Otherwise science traces pronounced atavism even after twice the five generations; and even a cursory glance at the world's map convinces us that either to efface entirely or to create anew a distinctly blooded national type, thousands rather than hundreds of years would be necessary.

Thus are we obliged to fall back on the constitution of the United States as to legal limitation and on the actual merits of the case as to substance, arriving at the sweeping assertion that true Americanism is rather to be considered as an embodiment of deeds, than as a thing derived from or based on family parchments. Family traditions and privileges are indeed playing but a poor second in this new national organization, the initial programme of which was to recruit the best forces of the whole world to test, educate, and finally enrol them in the lists of that American minority which, *de facto*, if not officially, directs the affairs of the national realm.

As a matter of fact, the national origin of the American will be found traceable to the feeling of solidarity, and to the common purpose of a group

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

of energetic workers and thinkers, mostly of English descent, who believed in the possibility of building up a state and a national community on the basis of the greatest individual freedom and the initiative of the citizen engaged in honest personal work. Being fully conscious of the enormous natural resources of the country, they recognized clearly the necessity of drawing foreign brain and brawn into it, as well as capital from other lands,—and therefore saw the best guarantee for the land's future in the doctrine of "Freedom for All," which they proclaimed.

Absolute freedom of conscience and opinion, the greatest scope for personal activity and initiative, with the least legal interference, full guarantee of individual property—those were then the chief traits of the new-born state, while the readiness to stand in defence of it all, vividly realized by the great masses of the citizens, formed the true foundation of American patriotism.

All this was but the result of the many varied and hard experiences of several generations in the colonial times. Hardships and difficulties thus served as the great primary education of that brainy minority to whom the country owes the

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

clear laying down of the Constitutional principles and directions guaranteeing her successful growth. To grasp it all, one has to bear in mind the diversified human elements that were then pouring unceasingly into the land—goldseekers and adventurers of all kinds, runaway and liberated convicts, and even whole colonies of convicts. It became the organized refuge of English bankrupts, the best field for speculation and exploitation for the capital of the mother country, and at the same time the true land of liberty for those seeking liberty and personal independence from all the countries of Europe.

It was the neutral ground where the persecuted Huguenot of Coligny met the equally persecuted Roman Catholic of Lord Baltimore. The austere Cromwellian Puritan jostled against the gay Cavalier of the Stuarts. Finally it was the promised land and haven of security to all idealists and social reformers. Add to all this, the difference of temperament, and other national peculiarities, and the heterogeneous picture is complete. Starvation and the Indian tomahawk soon united all into one homogeneous mass, notwithstanding the difference of creeds and opinions, and obliged them

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

to agree on the premisses of the *New Ideal of Realities* forced on them by the despotic conditions of their existence in the new land—conditions which demanded, first and foremost, personal courage, reliability of character, as well as individual initiative and efficiency, and steadiness and capacity for work as the most desirable traits in a fellow-man. Under the protection of the British bayonets, chiefly in the larger cities, many religious, political, and even class conflicts were engaged in ; but even here the interests of the Commonwealth, built up by the unceasing and well-directed efforts of the leading spirits, soon prevailed and were valiantly defended against the French and Indians.

A new kind of local patriotism was then manifested, closely united with the individual's work and his future, and sufficiently strong to secure a united front in the War of Independence. The experiences of the past were not forgotten, however. The Declaration of Independence as well as the United States Constitution embody them, and are remarkable for their broad, liberal spirit and absolute absence of demagoguery ; therein are found the essentials of *national* life resting upon a basis of the broadest possibility of *individual* existence.

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

From all this it is clear that Americanism, in its true sense, implies more than the mere accident of birth. It means active solidarity and eager interest in the life and growth of the country, and the firm belief in the glory of the task undertaken by America, that of a higher cultural growth based on constitutionally guaranteed individuality and the best of chances for its development. Otherwise one can easily be born in the United States, just as well as in China, or Patagonia.

CHAPTER II

A CURSORY glance at the figures of any statistical report is amply sufficient to demonstrate practically the farsightedness of the *Fathers of the country*, when laying down the programme of its future activity. With a population nearer ninety than eighty millions, increasing at the rate of nearly a million a year, the United States average share of wealth *per capita* is, next to England's, the leading figure in the world. Her trade amounts to over five milliards a year, the export being double the import. Her products, natural as well as industrial, are well-known staples of the world's market. Hundreds of millions of her capital are engaged abroad, and a number of home firms have actually exported whole manufacturing plants, with machinery, workmen and engineering staffs, all American, to foreign countries, there to continue their special American method of manufacture ; while still the States remain the Promised Land of all individuals with a new patent, device, idea, or combination.

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

In fact, it is not in vain that the United States were dubbed "the Land of the Great Possibilities." But outside of that truly gigantic activity in the production and distribution of wealth in its material shape, no less intensity has been displayed in the direction of the practically applied work of social, economic, educational and other speculative activities of man.

In fact, it can be positively stated that hardly any scheme or propounded theory has not been tried and experimented upon within the Union. Outside of the Quakers and Mormons, there have been (some are there yet) a number of phalanstères and Communistic institutions and organizations of the Fourier, St. Simon, and other socialistic commonwealths. All creeds, beliefs and unbeliefs, organized, flourish alongside of each other, generally in absolutely friendly relations, under the protective motto of the land, "Free to all," to which life adds its equally potent dictum: "The best horse wins." For the students of sociology and economics, with their many problems, there will hardly be found another land so rich in instructive material and even theoretical interest as the United States. Even to-day the United States

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

continue to be the true sociological laboratory of the world. So much for the human material and its productive activity within the States, as well as for the fundamental ideas of their organization. And now as to the place that the whole occupies, as one of the national and political aggregates of the world.

To all intents and purposes it might be claimed, that like the individual, every nation passes through a number of graduated stages of growth and development. First, it must be capable of life, able to earn its subsistence productively and politically ; organized sufficiently strong to defend and maintain its independence. Secondly, it must be capable of keeping abreast of the times in growth and development, remaining within the front rank in order to ensure the continuity of its existence. Finally, the nation must take sufficient care of the mental growth within the land, to enable it to aspire to higher flights of culture, and thereby to secure its national future. Naturally enough, many changes take place within a national aggregate, gradually evolving from a preceding lower to the next higher stage, changes in the life pursuits of the majority of its inhabitants as well as in their

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

customs and manners. To follow Buckle's graphic pictures of the "History of Civilization in England," the herdsman and hunter turns agriculturist, then producer of the natural raw material, and an adept in the higher cultivation of the soil—to become subsequently merchant and industrialist, and finally to end as the matador of the world's market, and a financial power in a position to bestow the blessings of civilization upon mankind, knowledge, ethics and æsthetics keeping pace with the national progress.

But from the American point of view, there is serious doubt about the deductive part of this presentation, namely, whether, when it is claimed that the desirable height of development—economical and intellectual—has been reached, we are able to look down on the mere brutal features of the ancestral man, the mere physical strength and purely animal courage of the rough soldatesque, as nothing more than the rudiments of a barbarous age, luckily past, keeping only the gentle side of the gentleman in sight and laying stress on the loftier emotional and higher intellectual only. On the contrary, it would almost appear as if the successful entrance to the higher cultural stadium

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

should be found conditioned by the preservation of the strong elements previously acquired by the race ; and that the perfect physical development, endurance, tenacity and personal valour of the original ancestor, who successfully contended against elements and beasts of prey, are the basal resource and qualifications of the successful champion in the later stages, not excluding finance, statesmanship and politics. In fact, when looking attentively at the pictures of the historical cinematograph, one cannot help associating the downfall of highly developed and eminently cultured human groups with the weakening of their frames and the general softening down of the breed. The true source of our strength, the real capital we start in life with, being inseparable from that frame and its state of perfection, we depend on it for the energy indispensable to the performance of our greatest deeds.

Thus, while there can be hardly any doubt that the United States has successfully passed the first stages of national development, the third degree, that of higher culture, is sure to offer a vantage ground for many opposing and antagonistic ideas. This being in reality the true subject of discussion,

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

let the old Anglo-Saxon "*Fair and Square*" prevail! The future welfare and safety of the countries must be taken as the axiom to which the argument has to be reduced—I mean the true weal of the national group, tangibly apprehended, and disregarding the abstractions originating in the lofty planet of Mars, or the equally potential *Oneness* of humanity—this human race to which the Malay with his poisoned criss, the missionary-eating cannibal, and the dwarf from the interior of Africa with his poisoned arrows, are supposed to belong on equal humanitarian footing with the best of the men in our national groups. All that might sound very poetical, but it is far from touching our present necessity of remaining the *top dogs*!

CHAPTER III

NEXT, coming to the articles of the Indictment, I have classified them with reference to the public activity of the country. Productive, political, social, and under a separate heading—because having less bearing upon vital interests—the social superstructure of the æsthetic and ornamental.

In my rationalistic way, I propose starting with the first group, which conditions the very existence of the others, as it were. In fact, before anything else, society at large has to produce enough to square the cost of her existence ; also to produce enough for the increase in population ; to contribute its quota for the proper care of the aged and disabled ; to spend large amounts on the continual improvement of the national working plant. All this counts as a mere necessity of existence, and as such, must plainly be attended to before actual life, with its possibilities of higher enjoyment, can be taken into consideration or the higher realm of abstractions be approached.

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

Therefore the first criterion, as to the vital capacity and soundness of a group, must always be found in the production of extra worth as well as in the full consciousness of such necessity, spread within the group. General Weal then is synonymous with the *Increase of Worth* in the land ; general calamity with the *destruction* thereof.

Furthermore, work being duly honoured in the community as the chief means of welfare, the number of drones encountered, wasting away their lives and property without any benefit to themselves or to their fellow-men, serves as an accurate indication of the actual state of that community.

This being noted as axiomatic, I approach Count I. of the indictment. It runs : "Americans worship only money, or what can be bought by or reckoned in money."

I must say this is somewhat of a risky throw on the part of the Honourable J. B.—himself proverbially known as rather partial to a solid basis for his national currency, for which, *nota bene*, I have always admired him. However, to reply, leaving the things that money cannot buy for future discussion under another heading. What does the Dollar represent but the embodi-

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

ment of man's work, together with the possibility of further productive activity beneficial to all? And by what logical effort does one arrive at the honouring of labour and work, and the despising of the very results obtained by it? Evidently, then, no sound community or individual member thereof can be otherwise than partial to money as *a means*. The criticism is aimed rather at the consideration of money as the end, being apparently directed against the numerous individuals found in America, who seem to make the accumulation of money the sole aim of their existence. In reply to this, it might be justly claimed, that nobody can affirm that a Sanford, Carnegie, Pullman, Gerard, or any other of the hundreds of cash-storing human quantities, did not dream of their universities, libraries, special schools, working men's model institutions, infirmaries and colleges, etc., from the very commencement of their effort to amass fortunes. It certainly was the case with Peter Cooper, who always talked and speculated about his *Cooper Union Institute*. I have it from his grandson. If so, they surely did the only right thing towards realizing their dreams, by first working at the means of realization.

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

Further, it must be mentioned that one of the salient traits of the American is his public spirit, a quality hardly taken account of abroad, though fully developed and easy to notice in the country itself. It is also true that most of the gigantic public enterprises are found to be owing to the initiative and work of private individuals. Men, in fact, like Sanford, McCay, Huntington, Mills, and others, who amassed their millions by joining the Atlantic with the Pacific by a ribbon of rails, or men who, like the Vanderbilts, originated a network of railways, were actually bent on something more worthy and more closely connected with the needs of the whole country than the mere amassing of money.

Again, another trait of the American life bearing on the issue has to be taken in consideration. It is a historical fact that from the earliest times the United States men have been specially trained to the habit and discipline of work ; and to this very characteristic of the United States man, a great deal of the feverish activity so noticeable all over the country must be ascribed. The famous, " Let him do something " of Steve Elkins, when speaking about his prospective son-in-law, the Duc d'Abruzzo,

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

is but the general sentiment and opinion of the whole country. "A man who does nothing" is simply declared, "No good," with a big N, whether he possesses millions or not. This is strictly connected with an almost national peculiarity of the American, very pronounced among the rich men, namely, their ability to derive a greater pleasure and interest from their work than from almost anything else. It actually seems to be almost a second nature with the American. Whether the thing he is busy with is a shoe-string manufactory or a large suspension bridge, his whole soul is in it; and to all appearance he is more aglow with interest about the venture itself and its success, than about the money it brings.

One thing is sure, that with the exception of the English and Russian nobility—neither of whom made their money, while most of the Americans did—there is hardly another national type which, "Outside of business, if you please," is ready to part, or in the habit of parting, so lavishly with the object of his worship, as the American. In fact, they are generally recognized as the "Very good thing" throughout the whole of the continent.

Count No. II. reads: "Their sole contribution

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

to the world's civilization is a number of engineering mechanical devices. Even in machinery they do not, however, excel, since it is invariably made badly. American machinery never lasts, it is made to come early to the scrap heap."

If nought else, the United States have certainly contributed to civilization the analytical reduction of that bullying abstract compound to its elementary tangible substances, in addition to demonstrating to the world at large that the work in that direction has to start at the foundations, and not with the æsthetically ornamented superstructures of the roof. The "Free to all" as well as "equal chances to all" are certainly heretical enough to be recognized as genuine Americanisms, and to these very elementary principles the "Old World" will have to come if it does not want to go to pieces like Rome or Carthage. The German has a quaint proverb expressing the sensation of being baffled. The Teuton says: "He stood there, like oxen at the foot of the Bamberg"—"Da stehen die Ochsen am Bamberge, and können nicht weiter." Bamberg is in South Germany, Bavaria, a high mountain, the ascent of which calls for a multiple team, and cannot be attempted

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

by only one ox. I must say I felt something like that Teutonic quadruped when reading the foregoing charge. With old Ben Franklin's lightning rods all over the world ; in a country where Faraday has so beautifully worked out Count Rumford's early notions about the transmutability of energy ; a country that has made the best of Fulton's first steamboat, made the best use of Captain Maury's studies and investigations of the Gulf Stream ; has used for years Morse's code of telegraphy ; a country in which Edison's phonograph and cinematograph are popular, and daily contribute to the enjoyment of old and young ; where every car is stopped with a Westinghouse brake, and most of the houses are supplied with telephones ; where cotton spinneries are daily reaping the advantages of Whitney's discovery of his gin in handling cotton ; where old Remington's typing-machine is still holding its own against all comers ; where Roebling's type of suspension bridge is gradually superseding the old tube system ; where a man cannot go any distance without meeting with the old Buckeye harvesters, reapers and binders, with hay tedders and horse rakes, or steel drills—all with a big A as to origin (though, of

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

course, they are badly made and do not last). In the face of all that (the list capable of an almost infinite extension), such a sweeping assertion as that of Charge II. can be explained only as due to ignorance.

As to the durability of American machinery, it is found to be the direct result of the processes used, and the very American plan of work, which ought to be familiar to anybody, however slightly acquainted with the matter ; it is the very opposite of the Continental and the English. When in Germany a short time ago, I was greatly astonished at the ancient look of many German locomotives and railway cars ; and having acquired the pesky habit of poking my nose—considerably sharpened in the States—into all things I did not fully understand, I had no peace till the thing was explained to me. It appears that some of those so carefully made locomotives began their working career in the 'seventies—when I myself was studying in Germany. Barring necessary repairs, they had been active ever since.

Now in the States they generally calculate a railway locomotive good for fifteen years ; for quick traffic only for twelve years ; and they

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

design and construct it accordingly. This they do, estimating that during that period improvements will have sufficiently advanced to make the use of the old type a dead loss.

The question then arises, which of the two systems is more efficient? And in answer to it, the good Yankee will not fail to appear with his reckonings of numerous items, such as loss of time ("Time is money"). In the poor work of the engine, waste of costly fuel without the proper return, continual repairs, absolutely costly, since the hand labour of skilled mechanics and not the cheap but efficient work of the special machine stamping out the separate pieces would necessarily have been used. This, taken all together, with the proper *reckoning* of interest, would represent a capital sufficient to construct a good pair of new and efficient engines. All this goes against the *eternal* and everlasting system.

Equally in England. Some years ago, when not rusty in the subject, I knew the machinery of the cotton manufacturers in Lowell, Mass., again limited to a few years' use—to produce nearly twice the amount of yards a day, per weaving stool, as its fellow "across the Pond." I hope these

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

English *superior makes* have since been replaced by the inferior American, which give better returns for less labour.

On the whole, therefore, there are two sides to the question, each side having its advantages. But I am sure the American is far ahead in making good use of his scrap iron, and the potent fact remains undeniable that it is *he* and nobody else who gave birth to the true civilising agent—
SAPOLIO.

CHAPTER IV

COUNT III. reads : “ Their reputed business is a myth. Really they have only the forms of business ; they are slower and more unbusiness-like than any other people.”

On what basis an activity of yearly $x y$ milliards is of a sudden found to be unbusiness-like, and possessing merely business forms, ye gods might know ! I certainly do not, even by straining my imaginative faculty to its utmost. However, having spent a good quarter of a century in the United States, and been brought into personal contact with a number of leading business men, and never failing to observe, study, and compare, I have reached certain conclusions as to business activity in the States.

To begin with. There are two entirely different schools of business, varying as to origin, notions, and therefore also working differently : the Anglo-Saxon, with old Hansa, the Dutch, and the English as pioneers and teachers ; and the Continental

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

Oriental. Real Americans belong to the first, and pride themselves on having often outstripped their masters. This, of course, does not exclude either the presence of the often successful activity of the others in the land, though the main business issues of the country have been so far outside of their reach. Thorough knowledge of things, that of the markets and their possibilities, is typical of the first group. Good honest merchandise, at a figure allowing strenuous competition and a chance to make its use public in the world at large, are their chief line of activity, the success depending on the popularity of the goods, acquired through their real merit and the actual advantage thus offered to the public.

The study of future chances and combinations, of new and possible markets and the natural demand of the prospective centres—this is the working direction of the said business group. On strict analysis it is certainly found to be purely intellectual and almost abstract mental work, which, like any other intellectual pursuit, is fully sufficient to absorb the whole interest of a brainy man, filling his existence entirely and satisfactorily. It opens a new world to him, unceasingly forcing

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

new studies and enquiries upon him. It also spurs him on with new zest, increasing his interest by the novelty of the vistas opening before him. It is certainly apt to maintain the consciousness within the individual of not having lived in vain; of having created something of real use for his group at large, or at least of having honestly endeavoured to do so. In sum, then, it is the idea, the scheme of combination, beside the thorough knowledge of things, their possible value and practical availability, that remain the most important factors with this group. Man enters here into account only so far as he possesses the capacity of being helpful in carrying the thing through, or with the grand mass of the customers as the ultimate objective.

Equally involved in this are the interests of the producer, the distributor and the financier, too much mixed up with each other to permit of a distinct separation within the working group. They simply work hand in hand. Historically they had started with the wide world open before them, distributing new products of use, but not known in the various foreign countries, at the time of the famous Hansa trading with China through

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

Russia, and in that course they still continue. If anything, it is just the reverse with the other group. Nature and her products, manufactories and their articles, the goods in a word, are only secondary with them, while the single man, or group of men, with all their weaknesses, prejudices and stupidities, are the chief study and interest, as they are the objective of the exploitation process. Group combinations, generally on the war path with each other, constitute the first noticeable feature. The manufacturer is exploited by the distributor, and the distributor in his turn becomes the lawful prey of the man of the Exchange. The public are the sheep sheared—otherwise swindled purely and simply. One kind of merchandise is sold for another. Each single buyer is treated with an almost artistic knowledge of the foibles of human nature. In a word, the real commercial article is before us, giving the true solution of the old riddle, as to why Mercury was the patron of commerce and at the same time the god of all thieves and robbers. That the dollar is the Alpha and the Omega with these people is only natural, and equally that their methods and training should be just the opposite of the other group. In fact, it is

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

just on account of the negative transactions of these "commercial venturers," that all the greater American concerns employ attorneys to work out a number of legal forms as a means of protection in their business transactions.

With the most liberal laws in the country, aiming at educating the individual in protecting himself, rather than exercising any shielding tutelage over him (only direct, gross frauds and swindles are within the pale of the law), and with the immense number of diversified negative talents landing yearly, it is but natural that certain sharp features should be in evidence in general business intercourse, and that even the doctrine should be popular according to which any man in business ought to be considered a *questionable quantity*, and be dealt with accordingly, until he has proved himself the contrary. Herein lies the distinct feature of American business—its perfect isolation from any social ties or relations.

As an illustration I may recall an old story about the millionaire John Drew, whom Jay Gould had so badly left in the lurch, on the occasion of their famous *gold corner* on *Black Friday*. The gold dollar rose to two dollars in paper, and the United

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

Treasury had to come to the rescue with its metal resources to prevent a national panic. Well, then, John had an old chum of his youthful years to whom he had been greatly attached, but who had not fared as well as himself, continuing as a small employee in some kind of business. As it was, J. D. had become the powerful J. D., while his friend Harry, who had married and found himself at the head of a family, had the greatest difficulty in making both ends meet, until he also thought he saw a good chance looming before him in a new business venture. A few thousands were wanted, and he managed to scrape a part of the money together, but was unable to obtain the thousands still missing. He was so desperate over it as finally to bethink himself of John Drew, whom he had not met for years, and whom he even felt a grudge against for a slight he imagined himself to have received. Calling on his old friend, he asked him directly for the loan, offering his promissory note as a security. J. D. received him in the most friendly way, and ordered the cashier to make out the paper and pay the money, after he had cross-examined his old chum as to the prospects of the venture, and had found them satisfactory. How-

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

ever, owing to unexpected happenings, Harry did not have the cash ready when the note fell due. The day before the date of payment, he called on J. D. again, asking him for more time and the renewal of his paper. But old John proved a regular tartar : not only did he peremptorily refuse to wait, but he told his friend that he would sell him out at once, if the money was not paid before twelve o'clock the following day, when it became due. The poor fellow hurried away utterly desperate and indignant. With the greatest trouble, and at considerable sacrifice, he finally found the money for his note, but it was with anything but a loving glance that he threw it on the desk of the mighty Drew, calling him by a few very unparliamentary names besides. J. D. pulled out his watch—it was not yet twelve. Then he called the cashier, and had him take the greenbacks and bring the note which he handed to his friend. Harry tore the note into shreds and threw them at the feet of the capitalist, informing him once more that he was anything but a gentleman. “Not even human !” he cried, “in fact nothing but a money-grabbing beast !” After this emphatic declaration, friend Harry moved to

the door without even a good-bye for poor J. D.

“ Harry,” Drew called him back, “ I want to talk to you.”

Harry stopped with an indignant reply, wishing J. D. to some place with a proverbially high temperature, and then asked reluctantly—“ What is it ? ”

“ Well now,” said Drew, “ I have thought the matter over, and would be willing to supply you with a working capital of fifty thousand or so, to carry on your venture successfully.”

Of course Harry was nonplussed—“ Why, John,” said he, after a while, “ You have just made me pass a sleepless night, lose considerable money and get almost desperate, by refusing the prolongation of that miserable note ; and now, you say, you are ready to advance fifty thousand without security ? ”

“ Well, I guess I could afford to lose fifty thousand for the sake of our old friendship, Harry ; but I tell you, I cannot afford to lose one penny in business, and your note was strictly business. The fifty thousand are my private pleasure, and, as I say, I can afford to lose them. Besides, there is no necessity for it either. Your venture is O.K., and

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

safe enough, I can tell you as much. All it needs is capital."

This tells the whole story, and such incidents could be quoted *ad libitum*.

The next thing to mention is, that the famous *uncle in the consistory* in Austria, who had considerable power and strong clan feeling besides, is an unknown quantity in the States. In fact, any talented stranger, coming from "the Lord only knows where" has an even, if not a better, chance with the business potentate, to get a snug berth in business, than the direct relations, friends and acquaintances. "Putting all one's eggs into a single basket" is not the American style. The average well-to-do man is generally interested in at least a couple of dozen of various ventures. For instance, one of my good acquaintances (and patrons) hailing originally from the north of the New York State, had to my knowledge the chief interest in one of the leading magazines, then a Smyrna rug factory, and the biggest part of an automobile factory, besides numerous mining interests of all kinds, and quite a word to say in one of the local railway systems. He could hardly spare the time for his meals, was continually on the

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

go, working like an ox, and felt immensely interested, happy and contented all the time.

As a matter of fact, most of the larger business ventures being organized as stock companies and corporations (in the American sense of the word, meaning any incorporated undertaking with limited liability), the competition of the sharpest kind being the habitual order of things, and all other factors in reference to what could be bought for money being equal between the competitors, that company gets the best of it which has the best and most talented men at its head. For this purpose men of ability and reliability of character are taken, wherever found, at a generous price, and entirely in defiance of relations, friends and acquaintances. All this goes under another heading, as old John Drew put it.

Of course, the typical features here quoted are characteristic of the wholesale, but the same spirit has been inculcated by the Americans in retail business as well. A. T. Stewart was the first who, half a century ago, opened his famous store in New York with *one price*. That the goods were warranted as to quality and quantity to be absolutely as represented, was his leading principle in

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

dealing with the public. He was followed by J. Wannamaker, of Philadelphia, who finally took up Stewart's business in New York, buying it from the Hiltons, Stewart's successors.

Of course there is considerable foreign ability and capital engaged in business in New York, and in most of the great cities of the land. Some branches of industry in New York—tailoring, confectionery and haberdashery—are almost exclusively in foreign hands. As a whole, these elements are far from answering to the business description I have just sketched. Still I had better retire in favour of a few gentlemen of my acquaintance, better qualified to treat the subject.

First, a certain Mr. R., a perfect type of Yankee origin, dealing in millions, and having over a quarter century of experience in business, who, on being asked about the national peculiarities found in business in the States, answered: "My knowledge does not go outside of city limits. Beyond them I deal through my local agents and the like. But I can sum it up passably clearly for you, as to the city, and I surmise there will not be much difference elsewhere. Well, then, as to the *East side* (orientals), I deal only on spot-cash con-

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

ditions, irrespective of Bradstreet quotations and references. The East side is quoted as poor risk by the insurance men. They consider it too inflammable, and do not touch anything East of Bowery. I sell very willingly to a Frenchman or an Italian, almost on their own conditions, but would not have any one of the breed participate in any one of my undertakings, even if they were milliardaires. Those chaps talk too much."

"Well, how about the Germans, then, Mr. R.?"

"Hamburg and old German houses O.K. A.1, as good as English, but the balance of them, Berlin, Frankfurt and the like, not my choice. Too much time and energy wasted in etiquette, propriety, and the like ballast. All a prime article socially, but not in business."

Another one of my acquaintances was a certain Mr. H., whose dealings are extending to all countries of the world, and who had been building up his immense trade for nearly half a century, starting on the Pacific coast at first. I often bothered him also with my questions about business features, with the pertinacity and unconventional innocence of a professional bookworm. In fact, I learned probably more from that gentleman than his two boys

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

from me, though I have been proud of their school-work. "Well, then," I asked him once point blank when we were indulging in our after-dinner smoke, "Mr. H., you export and import enormous figures, tell me, with whom do you deal in preference? What country, I mean?"

"Well, Baron, to tell you frankly, J. B. is my favourite. One is always sure to get his money's worth from him."

"Why, you really astound me, sir. Is he the only fellow of that description? How about the Germans for instance?"

"Oh, well, you can be sure of honest quantity, with them, that's sure, but you often get stuck on quality."

"And the French?"

"You get your quality for your money, sir, but not the quantity."

"And the others?"

"Not worth mentioning, Baron. Without special guarantees you run the risk of getting the worst of the bargain both as to quantity and quality."

And now coming to the Exchanges. Here almost an international gathering is faced, and

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

still the old American blood holds more than its own. Not that he would not suffer his Waterloo, as well as the others, but he is known never to refuse to square up his debts so long as he has anything to pay with. Thus he finds a better chance to begin over again than the others. I knew personally several gentlemen who were in turn millionaires and beggars, several times during the dozen of years or so I had the chance to follow their fortunes. One of the most typical was, I remember, Rufus Hatch, generally called "Uncle Rufus," who was said to have organized more companies and to have listed more new stock on the old 'Change than any other man living in the States. I remember him once, at a confidential bachelors' spread, giving earnest advice to one of the young smarties who wanted to know about the best way of listing a new undertaking. "Go to the best lithographer of New York, my son, and see that he makes you the prettiest picture on your paper, my son. We all are fond of pretty pictures, and buy them."

I mention this gentleman's name in full, as he has been dead for some years.

So much about my impressions concerning

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

American business. As an abstract obscure dealer in abstract mental products, I understand and see how some American men may have gotten into discredit, but I would call the attention of J. B., who proverbially stands for the fair and square, that those kind of Americans are far from being typical of the country or its spirit. They are rather the types of the original places they hail from, such as Frankfurt, Cracow, Buda Pest, or Brody, and especially poor Russia, which, before departing from, they brought to the very verge of destruction.

CHAPTER V

COUNT IV. reads : “ American education is superficial and vulgar. It does not produce any scholars or men of taste, but only quaint learned men and vulgarians.”

Should education, one of the most powerful factors in the life of a nation, have for its most important, if not sole, aim, the production of perfect scholars and men of cultivated taste, I certainly would be the first to acknowledge the appositeness of the criticism, contenting myself with the mere quotation of the old Russian proverb, which says, “ that even in Paris they cannot make rice out of oats.” In so doing I would suggest the fact that no perfect scholar or man of really good and delicate taste can ever be made by education only, and that it is rather to Dame Nature than to the educational institutions that such characteristics owe their inception. I would further point out the fact, scientifically established, that a preparatory work of generations is needed to produce any really great intellectual personage,

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

and that the educational agency of the country, though it is of great help to such an individual, plays only a very secondary part in the issue. Thus Pascal worked out a good part of Euclid, drawing his geometrical figures on sand with his stick, while guarding his sheep. Adrian Brower, who had never yet taken any drawing lessons, made some of his best sketches in his garret with charcoal stolen out of a dealer's bag. Edison had never graduated from a college, and had worked out his Duplex system of telegraphy on the car, when a boy of the News Company on the train. His self-made batteries led him into perpetual trouble with the baggage master, on account of the goods spoiled by the acids. Gogol was the poorest of scholars, and never learnt to spell. Stephenson, though a genius to whom a good part of our vaunted civilization is due, was illiterate. And equally would I claim that it takes more than all the colleges combined to make a Ruskin, a Spencer, or a Mendelejeff. All that, however, though bearing on the subject, would be but an indirect and lengthy way to proceed, while the question can certainly be approached directly, and in a perfectly lucid way.

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

Basing my affirmation on figures, I might state as a preamble that the United States is just the country where the value of education was most appreciated, and where more energetic work and more capital have been expended on it than in any other country ; where more money is spent on it even to-day than anywhere else. But whether we should consider the existence of scholars and men of taste as a criterion of national work in education, is somewhat doubtful. As it is, the many diversified aspects of the educational issues have been studied and experimented upon in the States ; and it is certainly in America, and in no other country, not excepting even Germany, that the full and deep signification of the Spencerian precepts in education have been most fully appreciated and made the most use of. Considering the far-reaching importance of education for any land, one is obliged to decide at once upon the character of the work, before any standardization is attempted. It is first necessary definitely to decide whether the *national* or *international* basis and spirit is to underly education ; and next, attentively to weigh all real, practical advantages in life which the individual is actually to derive from the course

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

of instruction. But no sooner is the issue considered from that special point of view than the all-important question arises, whether the *minimum* or *maximum* of the mass school-drill training is the most beneficial to the great majority, is most likely to enhance their material chances in life, and fully to develop their individual potentialities? True education, in fact, consists in the bringing out of all natural capabilities and in the training of such for the greatest benefit of the individual and of his group, since only by this means can the natural talent be enhanced and the very often merely atavistic predispositions and faculties be successfully developed which are of such great importance to both society and its unit. And exactly for that reason, it is not so much the amount as the nature and kind of information, as well as the capacity of the subject to assimilate it and make the best of it, that will be found of the greatest importance. So much is this the case, that the true kernel of education, implying as it does the elements of correct thinking, will often be endangered in its growth by an early process of cramming. Once, however, due caution has been exercised in this direction, and the important

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

discipline of work secured, the true educational foundation can be said to be there, provided that a healthy bodily growth and training, as well as the early acquisition of good personal habits, have been properly seen to. The subsequent work will be found comparatively easy, and the development of the subject remains perfectly individual.

But in subjecting the poor creature to an early mass-drill the risk is imminent of obtaining merely the average unattractive article with the finer individual shadings nicely drilled out of him. But, over and above these purely pedagogical considerations, it remains a fact that, outside the liberal professions, most of the life pursuits require a very early mental and bodily training, specially adapted to the acquisition of a certain dexterity of manipulation and quickness of perception, on which future efficiency in the special branch depends. The acquisition of these qualities is rendered hopeless by the prolongation of the school years (which should extend to fourteen, at the utmost to fifteen, for the Northern; eleven or twelve for the Southern country) so that a mediocrity instead of efficiency in the special line adopted is

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

what is obtained in exchange for a little additional information. Bearing all this in mind, and with the full list of colonial ancestors and present-day self-made men before them as practical illustrations, it is but natural that the thinking men of these United States should have reflected earnestly on the nature and exact quantity of that minimum of school-knowledge that the young ones were to receive from the country as the starting outfit for their life's journey.

In truth, what were the school advantages of that galaxy of genial men who built up the country, created hundreds of industries, covered the land with railways and other communication lines, and stood untold political tornadoes, in and outside, without so much as budging from the position of trust assigned them by their countrymen? A backwood farm, hard work and school during a few winter months only, where the proverbial three R.'s were taught as the foundation of all. And yet what a beautiful and exact knowledge of the necessities and the deficiencies of life, private and public, and what a perfect familiarity with nature, animate and inanimate, is found in them! What gumption they displayed in the use of the few tools

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

at their command ! Gumption and personal initiative, trained by the very hardships of their early existence, certainly proved to them, and to the whole country as well, to be of much greater advantage than the most elaborate school programmes. Besides, almost every one of them is found to be an assiduous student in his leisure hours ; working all he could to reach the higher school branches and often even a profession. (Abe Lincoln splitting rails, driving oxen, and studying Blackstone to become a lawyer !) They acquired information so much the better and the more thoroughly as life itself taught them the value of it. A real Kindergarten of life then, that would certainly more nearly conform with the educational ideas of old Pestalozzi and Comenius, and also serve as a brilliant illustration of the Spencerian educational principles. Individual life preservation first ; social or group life preservation, next ; and only subsequently the superstructure. “ The science of the higher enjoyment of life ” awaiting the individual after his life capacity and earning of a sustenance, and his usefulness and readiness to do his part of the work as a solidary member of his group, had been secured. From the homogeneous and simple to the heterogen-

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

eous and complex ; or from the concrete to the abstract, and not otherwise. A national education—the only one acceptable and safe—is bound to adhere to these lines, leaving the superstructure to the care of private initiative, as representing but a luxury, so long as the work below still remains capable of improvement.

An education that unfits instead of fitting the individual to encounter the manifold, sometimes very drastic, calls of life, is anything but a blessing to that individual, and fitness for life certainly implies the capacity of earning a living. This, then, must of necessity be the primary consideration. Again, an education that does not bring up a man in full harmony with nature and his fellow-men, that does not make him a useful and active member of his national group, is a failure and a mightily dangerous failure since it weakens the national force by estrangement of whole groups of men from each other ; and from the national point of view it remains a failure even when producing scholars and men of taste. These exquisites are very apt to ask, with Marie Antoinette : “ Why don't you give them cakes, if you have no bread to give them ? ”

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

But even in regard to the learned professions, it is nature, and not the 'varsity calfskin or degree, that makes the real doctor, lawyer, scientist, or any other special student. Nature takes her time in doing it, and employs a number of generations to accumulate the nervous power and mental predisposition within the breed before a Harvey, a Henley, Billoth, or McKanzie, a Skoda, Herba or Rokitansky, a Mendelejeff, Bertholet, a Bichât, or again a Walter Scott, Dickens, Fennimore Cooper, Victor Hugo, a H. Spencer, or Huxley, Goethe, or Rousseau, are produced; and the very discredit of all calfskins and honourable degrees, if not backed by personality, met with in United States proves quite clearly that the Americans long ago discriminated between vocation and mere profession, arriving at the conclusion that profession without the enthusiasm and work intensity of vocation was not the thing to boast of, after all.

I am entirely ignorant of English statistics on this subject, but ready to affirm that 10 per cent. of the professional individuals in the States are actually real doctors, lawyers, good technical men, and so forth; and it is a great question for me, whether

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

the remaining ninety per cent. would not have done better to follow some industry or trade for which they were better fitted by nature. I am almost convinced that they would have enjoyed the other thing better themselves, and certainly would have been more useful to society.

The subject of vulgarity I leave for future consideration when I shall touch upon ethics and æsthetics ; but in connection with educational issues, I certainly must affirm that an education which leaves the building up of a strong character out of consideration is a failure, even if brilliant otherwise. In fact, the *educated rascal*, so familiar a figure nowadays, is an anomaly, and a blackmail on honest pedagogics.

Furthermore, in addition to all those considerations, it has to be remembered that with a territory of over 3,000,000 square miles, or twenty times that of the British Isles, and the vast differences of climate, soil and occupation that exist in the United States, there is an urgent necessity of adapting educational work to the special requirements of the local centres of the inhabitants, a process which naturally results in diversity of standards and methods in the work pursued. This

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

is evident in comparing the superior work done by most of the public schools in the West, where the population is more uniform, and the American element predominating, with that done in those in the East, where the foremost necessity is to naturalise the alien races by means of the public schools (Council Schools in England).

Therefore, it all depends whether education is to be taken as a mere burnishing and polishing process, chiefly calculated to make the exterior of the candidate for enlightenment generally presentable, or as one of the chief factors in national life, increasing the productive and intellectual potentiality of the national aggregate, making it more fit to meet the emergencies of national life, and strengthening the solidarity of the masses of its citizens by increasing their interest in and understanding of the affairs and needs of the commonwealth, by doing the best towards every single pupil, not by making him come up to a given standard of learning and polish, but by being helpful to him, and thus increasing his chances of accomplishing something tangible in life.

In the first case I have already entered my *noli prosequi*—I am fully conscious of the superior

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

quality of the finishing varnish process abroad. Not so, however, on the second count, with education defined as the fitting for private and national life. In this regard, I consider the United States as absolutely ahead.

I. The first Spencerian grade: Individual Life Preservation. Any United States lad from the public school shows more gumption and capacity of doing something than most of the foreign full-grown element on landing.

II.—Grade Social Self-preservation. The fellow educated in the United States has more public spirit in him, and a greater capacity for public affairs, than is the case anywhere else.

III.—The Higher Enjoyment of Life. The premisses by no means agreed upon, the true sense of it going deeper than the mere exterior form, even “if drest, in his best suit of clothes.” But the higher article has better chances in the Union after all, as it is not squashed so much as elsewhere by the deadening effect of our modern new shape of slavery, that of the *socially received formulæ and model figures!*

As a country, therefore, America has been perhaps more successful than others in her national educa-

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

tion. And her needs being different from those of others, she cannot be fairly judged by the standards of those others, and so much less by the standard of international and general education. The phrase does not sound badly, but the reality is eminently dangerous for any country, since it denationalises the citizen, and therefore destroys the foremost and strongest bulwark of the nation—the common solidarity of its inhabitants.

As to superficiality. In our age of the almost unlimited specialisation in all fields and branches of human enquiry, any average information is bound to be considered merely superficial, in England as well as in America. But the question arises, which of the two types can best fall back on something that he actually masters, outside of the general superficial information possessed by him; and, in this respect, I may be wrong, of course, but still I would lay my wager on the American article, as “Knowing something equally well, if not better than the other fellow.” This has been, for ages, a true Yankee doctrine, handed down in the country from father to son, not only as a theory but as solidly realised in practice as well.

CHAPTER VI

WE now approach a new group of notions, those referring to public activity and political life. These call for a few remarks before the criticisms in that direction are answered. Uncontestably, the millennium is "Das Ding an Sich" (a thing by itself), to use Emanuel Kant's terminology, while real life, with all it implies, is another, a widely different proposition, according to the exigencies of which a strict line of demarcation has to be drawn between our personal affairs, our duties and actions in private, and our public activity when representing the interests of others. The intermingling of these two conceptions, as well as the attempt at measuring them by one and the same standard of lofty principles and ideas, reads very well indeed, and sounds equally sonorously from the public rostrum, but, unhappily, it works very badly in practice, for it has a marked tendency to lower our standard of public efficiency, and certainly falls short of those poetic heights to which an individual is entitled to

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

aspire when dwelling in the dreamy land of his own meditations about the millennium. In fact, I am inclined to consider that the only trouble with Shylock, the actual weak point in his case, was the fact that he did business in his own right and under his own firm only. His case, if granted to be representative of a concern which included the interests of thousands of people, would have had an entirely different standing in the court. His Honour might have thought of all the orphans and women, all the aged and disabled, who suffered the loss of the money advanced in perfect good faith by Shylock, and not given in so lightly to Portia's Yankee trick. The truth of the matter is, that the unavoidable realities of our existence force upon us continually a kind of Jekyll and Hyde, a double-faced Janus, attitude in the midst of our struggle for existence, from which attitude we can hardly escape, unless, like the American, we strike a tolerably decent balance-sheet by strictly separating private and public activity.

Actually, this is exactly the reason why the American is so misunderstood and misjudged, as one can hardly imagine the same individual insisting on his pound of flesh in business, and at

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

the same time being the most generous and self-sacrificing fellow in private intercourse. And still it is evident that a man, acting as trustee for others, does not have the right to follow his bent of lofty personal abstractions in the ethical and æsthetical direction, at the expense of the material interests confided to him. Once having accepted his office of trust he is bound to obtain the pound of flesh due to his clients, and be ready to do so when consenting to his nomination. "Right or wrong, my country!" is of good Anglo-Saxon origin and gives the true "spirit of the thing." It cannot be effaced by any modern ethical sentimentality, this being one of the luxuries we can indulge only on condition that our existence has been securely guaranteed with the help of the old barbarian diction.

Further, a clear idea of the chief characteristics desirable in a public type must be grasped and adhered to, if the political work is not to be a failure. I refer to the two types of men so often confounded and yet so different in their qualifications, as the "Man of Deed," and the "Man of Thought." It must be remembered that the only weakness of Plato's Republic was the selection of

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

the "Man of Thought" for the work for which he is practically unfitted, and which is the natural domain of the "Man of Deed." However, as such a classification on my part is probably unfamiliar to the reader, I shall try to make the otherwise advantageous terminology clear. Thus a "Man of Deed," called popularly the "Man who knows," might be described as an individual with a clear head-piece, and energetic temperament, possessing a good knowledge of the country, and especially of the people outside his special corner, living in it. The "Man of Thought" (universal skyscraper, in German *Wolkenkratzer*) is a more definite quantity in the United States. He might be called the "Man who understands," a fellow capable of logically co-ordinating the things he knows; understanding their mutual relations and their comparative import for the country at large. Rather meditatively disposed and himself generally the product of generations of mental workers, he is less ambitious than the other, and habitually more interested in discovering new relations of things than in working out things already known. Each of these types has his own functions in the group, but the generally superior mental qualifi-

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

cations of the thinker, indispensable as they are for the sanitation and guidance of public opinion, are of so peculiar a nature as almost to unfit him for public and especially political life, where not only opposite views and theories, but also conflicting group interests have to be conciliated and compromised. In fact, his counsel is as valuable as his direct activity is useless.

Then, once more the lines of demarcation ought to be drawn and the distinctive functions of the Legislative, as representing the mass of the people directly, and of the Executive, clearly apprehended. This is necessary for the simple reason that constructively there is a great difference in the kinds of authority vested in each. Undeniably the people are the true and only source of power in the appointment of their trustees, the Government; but there their power ceases, whilst the competency of the Government thus appointed is found on analysis to be greater than that of the very people appointing it. On good constitutional grounds the Government can even be considered under an obligation to oppose the will of the people, when that will seems likely to endanger the interests represented by the Government. This is because

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

the people embody only the living generation, while the Government of any country, irrespective of its form, is the keeper of national traditions, and the guardian of future generations whose interests it is bound to protect at any price, even against the very people who had appointed it. The constitutional limit of any generation is the right of *usufruct*, without injury to the national estate or curtailing of the possibilities of the future heir.

After the discussions of the axiomatic part of the subject, let us return to politics proper.

Count V. reads: "Their politics are more corrupt than any other that the world has known."

With a homogeneous population, drilled and disciplined, sometimes very energetically (you were liable to be hanged in Great Britain for one hundred and twenty-eight different misdeeds, up to the 'thirties of the last century, if I am not mistaken), John Bull has, indeed, no hard task to criticise the mercenary influence in politics. Still, it is a great question how matters would stand with him, if, like the United States, he were naturalising over half a million of aliens yearly, fresh citizens, whose ethics and æsthetics are far from being

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

standardized, but who, under the Constitution, enjoy their full rights to take a direct share in the affairs of the country.

Now for a retrospect. After the terrible conflict between the North and South the country was in a deplorable state, economic and financial. The chief national problem lay in the improvement of these conditions by quickly developing the natural resources of the land, and raising its crippled industries to a height worthy of the country. All this was perfectly clear to everybody, and by the end of the 'sixties we find the best forces of the country throwing themselves into the commercial and industrial turmoil with the same impulsive energy they had displayed a few years previously in replenishing the thinned out ranks of the contending armies. The issue as to the Autonomic Centres with their full individual power, or that of the Central Authority governing the whole, had been fought out and settled definitely; while all other problems appeared to have been amply solved by the United States Constitution. Thus, it happened that the political affairs came to be considered as merely local issues, and as such were left to the care of professional politicians. A new

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

notion about the general theory, and especially as to the functions of the Government, then swept the popular mind. The governmental members of the Executive, according to this notion, were to be considered as mere servants of the people who gave them their offices, and to be therefore directly accountable to the people in their official activity ; while the people themselves, or at least the best elements among them, were entirely given up to the strenuous work of creating millions for the country and millions for themselves. With this class of men, politics certainly ceased to be a gentlemanly pursuit, and most of the political organisations throughout the country quickly fell into the hands of elements foreign by birth, mostly Irish, at least in the city centres, while the true American retained his full hold only among the *hayseeds*, who never retreated from their firm stand in the legislature of the various State capitals.

It was not a case of national indifference—the late war had just proved the contrary—but the fact was merely that the chief problem of the time consisted in the economic working and development of the country, crippled, as it had been, by the fierce and prolonged conflict. However, by

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

the 'seventies it began to be clear to any thinking person that something else was required from the Administration and Executive than the mere fulfilling of their official duties as legally prescribed ; and it became equally apparent that governmental employees without personal talents or initiative were unable to keep the national ship in the safe course, or steer it securely through the many difficult channels of politics. Disorders and agitation—originating in Socialism, until then unknown in America in an organised form and certainly foreign and absolutely antagonistic to the very spirit and nature of her institutions—began to make themselves conspicuous throughout the States ; numerous strikes not only crippled many branches of industry, but threatened even the railways, the very nerve of the country ; and, finally, the now organised mobocracies began to use politics as a new and well-paying means of extortion, a vice from which not even the legislative bodies were entirely free, levying as they did a heavy contribution on business for the privilege of pursuing it without continual molestation by the hundreds and thousands of officials of the many mushroom organisations incorporated in the State capitals with absolutely

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

unconstitutional powers. Then it became clear indeed, that the Executive of a large country could not well follow the governmental theory that that government is the best which governs the least. Then, also, the better classes of the citizens began once more to take an interest in public affairs, and it became evident to all that a careful selection of the fittest was as indispensable in public office as in business. American politics then entered a new phase, the best national eminent men taking an energetic active part ; displaying the same vigour and zeal as previously on the battlefield and in the economic work of regeneration of the land. They actually gained many a signal victory over their well organised and ably led opponents, but they also were forced to recognise that it would take them years of hard unceasing work and study before they would be able to master the situation, especially in the department of local affairs.

There is any number of able men and good fighters on their side, and doubtless they will succeed in the end ; but they will have to come down to the reality of things a great deal more, and learn many lessons from their antagonists *the Bosses* before they will ultimately master these gentlemen. Especially

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

have they much to learn as regards handling the great masses of the foreign born voters.

I will try to establish the correctness of my version by describing, somewhat incompletely I am afraid, my meeting with two well-known political personages in New York. Indeed, sufficiently *in power* were they to have their consent asked, even as to the appointment of a simple street sweeper in the city. Our meeting came about at the house of one of my friends, who was himself quite a chieftain among the Tammany Indians of New York; and, of course, it is but the spirit and the general views that I am able to put down as authentic:—

After due introduction to Mr. X. and Mr. Y., a famous Kentucky and a *bona fide* Habanna from the valley of Matanzas, the conversation ran on the subject of the Pittsburgh library donation of Andrew Carnegie.

“And now what do you think of it, Baron?” asked Mr. X, who had watched me attentively for some time, as if taking my measure.

“Oh! it’s great,” I answered. “With the many thousands of working men in the immediate vicinity I really think it very beneficial.”

“And do you really believe that the working

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

men are so anxious to read after a hard day's work?" asked Mr. Y. "I am inclined to think that it would be more human for them to prefer some comfortable rest, and possibly to be amused by somebody explaining the political situation of the moment, or the like, to them."

"There are working men and working men, Mr. Y.," I answered. "But outside of politics—which I do not pretend to argue—it would appear to me that the larger the number of working men who want to perfect themselves in their calling, the more the country's industry would be benefited by it, not to mention the worker's chance to better himself personally."

"This could apply to exceptional cases only. Coopers and Goodyears are not born every day, though, of course, the whole country honours their memory. But there are millions of average toilers in whom the true sense of public interest has to be inculcated so as to make good citizens out of them," argued Y.

"So that they may be able to vote for the right man, which means a tedious and long educational work," remarked our host.

"Well! gentlemen," I replied, "I am unable

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

to follow you. You surely will not claim that John Doe or Roe, who, let us say, are good mechanics and who, with just a little familiarity with the elements of technology, could be made really good men in their lines, self-trained to think correctly, would be more useful to the country if, suddenly taking stock in political oratory, they began to talk about things they understood least about, such as Political Economy, Free Trade or Protection, Municipal Government, and the like ? ”

“ Well, yes, John Doe and Roe we shall be obliged to leave to you. Such chaps have their heads so full of cog-wheels, pistons, and cylinders that not one single political idea would be grasped by them. Besides, such fellows are sure to make a success of it, and then contribute to our existence as professional politicians. However, this is nothing but an exception. Such men would on the highest computation represent but five per cent. of the total, while the ninety-five per cent. remaining would be sure to prefer a good glass of beer and some lively political speech or lecture to all your libraries and books in the world. And then your Doe and Roe are provided for, anyhow, by extra work, additional knowledge and special efforts. They generally reach their goal

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

in a comparatively short time, become independent and well-to-do, and then they are sure to bite into the political apple, so as to ensure the safety of their possessions. But the remaining ninety-five per cent., among whom you will find many men of character and ability, even if they do not cling to their professions too enthusiastically, must be taken in hand. All that the country offers to a man of energy and steady purpose must be made clear to him and he must be enabled to understand the land which he has selected for himself and his children."

"But, really," I replied, "such a process as you describe seems to be risky, if not absolutely dangerous, for the country. Your working man becomes indifferent to his life pursuit, his profession, he has his head filled with all kinds of unrealizable hopes and expectations ; and, finally, he gradually grows accustomed to awaiting his success in life from a political combination, instead of relying on the honest work of his hands and brains."

"Well, Baron, I am ready to grant you that this would be the case with a good half of the number, who are nothing but a flock of sheep, or *political*

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

food for cannons ; but you forget that such material was unavailable from the very start, and that neither Carnegie's libraries, nor Cooper's institutes nor the Churches and Sunday Schools could have ever succeeded in making *Whole Free Men* out of them. These people are born characteristic proletarian, herd and flock creatures, too weak and too indifferent and inert for conscientious activity or independent, individual thinking. Therefore it is eminently necessary to have them used and disciplined as masses. But the case of the remaining half is widely different. The majority of them, though not over anxious about their profession, are full of interest in the life of the country, and its conditions, and represent very acceptable material to our United States. As soon as they succeed in learning English, they begin to read and study, discuss and organise, and become really thinking creatures. They constitute a type of man who is ready to do his share of work ; just the kind who will catch up the floating votes of their own accord and bring them around to help the party in the most difficult and critical moments."

" Surely not out of exuberant patriotic feeling ! "

I remarked.

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

“Look here !” interposed Mr. X., looking sharply at me. “Do you believe, or can you even imagine that you would enthuse a Dago, or even one of my own countrymen from Tipperary or Limerick about the Mayflower Pilgrims or even the high notions of a Hamilton ? Or do you imagine that perhaps Y. here and I myself, when we first entered the rank and file of our political organisation in New York, were carried away by the notions of a Calhoun, a Webster, or a Henry Clay, though certainly nobody will deny to-day that I myself did do my level best to improve the conditions of our metropolis ?”

“No, sir ! to expect such things would be as foolish as to take this Kentucky here and retail it over the bars in the Bowery where the rough spirits, scratching and rasping the throat, are sure to be preferred. To value this whiskey, sir, one has to be educated up to it, and similarly, if not more so, with these other matters. To follow them up with any advantage, serious study and application are necessary, in addition to natural aptitude for abstract mental speculations ; and without these qualities no enthusiastic patriotism for the United States, which could be based only on historical

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

traditions and the lofty spirit possibly found in them is possible.”

“ But, my dear sir, outside all of this and far above it, there is the plain and natural attachment to the land, where, independently of birth and rank and in exchange for honest work, a man can build up a solid existence for himself, and where he can bring up a family secure in the consciousness that his children will have every right and chance to take their stand with the best men of the country, and really enjoy a higher kind of existence. My personal opinion is that a country can be considered strong or weak, exactly as its citizens are conscious or not of the solidarity of their own interests with those of the commonwealth. And the more such a consciousness is general and clear to everybody, the more readily does it serve as the true basis and foundation of the other more abstract national patriotism and allow it to become a great power, inspiring the individual to the greatest deeds of which a human creature is capable. On the Continent, where you continually meet with relics of local groups and family traditions, it might be different ; but here with us in the United States, we certainly expect that every citizen should realise

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

“why in hell” he should stand up for the United States, and such knowledge can be imparted to him only by means of a well devised political activity.”

“But, Mr. X., the fearful corruption connected with this political activity?”

“Is unavoidable in any human centre serving as the dumping-ground of all varieties of foreign elements, to whom political rights are granted even before the elements themselves have been assimilated, so that they become of great importance as a factor at election time. Against that I see but one remedy, though not an easy one to apply, namely, more stringent laws of naturalisation. But of this I can assure you that a successful political organisation, when sufficiently extended throughout the country, will soon do away with the purchase and sale of votes since the most barbarous and primitive way of proceeding in politics is ultimately the most injurious to political party interests. Moreover, it is my personal conviction that a fellow who votes for me in order to get his five dollars is a far more desirable and hopeful case than the other chap, who votes for me, but without the slightest notion why in the devil’s name he is doing it. I prefer him even to our wealthy citizen of

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

‘the refined,’ indifferent type, who considers it beneath his dignity to take any interest in public affairs and politics.”

I have quoted the above opinion of Mr. X., as he was a remarkable man and certainly one who always understood what he was speaking about. Notwithstanding all that was brought forward against him—unsuccessfully, it should be noted—nobody has ever contradicted what his party claimed in his favour, namely, that he was a man who never broke a promise and never went back on a friend; and the fact that his endorsement at an election was considered worth nearly the fifty thousand votes for a candidate in New York, proves that he had weight with the masses.

Other aspects of the question I shall touch upon later. Here I would merely add that bribery in politics is a passably rare occurrence outside of the city centres, where a large unassimilated foreign element is generally to be met with. The issue, in fact, is somewhat of an embroglio. The constituents are unable to grasp the true meaning of the election and are generally interested in the issue only so far as it affords them the chance of an additional dollar. But the politician, being fully

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

aware of the importance of the issue for the country at large, is morally bound to endeavour to carry it. To do that, he needs votes, and there are but two ways to get them. Either he must make a direct appeal to the understanding through the pocket, the crudest, but at the same time the surest, way of reaching the understanding, or he must play upon the worst nature of the mob by arousing passion, envy and hatred, group hatred, class hatred, thus injuring the national interests far beyond the actual national value of the election.

Evidently the first of these means is the lesser of the *two evils*, unless recourse is had to an amendment of the naturalization clause in the Constitution, but this would prove yet worse for reasons I expect presently to make clear.

CHAPTER VII

COUNT VI. reads : “ American public servants are, like the Russian officials, open to bribery without exception.”

I well remember the time, in the early 'seventies, when I barely escaped a pugilistic encounter in a Bowery restaurant, not a fashionable one, of course, for offering a tip to the man who had waited on me very creditably. The fellow was a born American, from American parents, and he wanted me, “ the damned greenhorn,” to understand that he was as much of a gentleman as myself. “ And what did I take him for ? ” and so forth, very aggressively indeed, until I managed to pacify him by assuring him that no offence had been intended.

But I equally well recollect how one of my friends in the importing business used to be specially favoured by the custom-house officials, while, personally, I have had more than one chance to

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

ascertain, not only in Russia and America, but the whole world over, how much better a fellow gets along in this vale of tears, especially when travelling, if he has cigars, small change and a joke, or a pleasant word at his disposal with which to bribe his fellow-men, officials or not officials, into something like an accommodating spirit. I remember, for instance, how a dollar bill, delicately handed, has often secured me good seats in crowded churches where people were jammed herring fashion to listen to some of our great fellows in the pulpit, like old Dr. Chapin, or my good friend and endorser of my work, Henry Ward Beecher. But I must confess my sense of higher morals was so blunted that it never occurred to me to lower the obliging sexton in my estimation. On the contrary, I remained grateful to him even beyond the cost of the dollar. Still, outside of the international readiness to accept a cigar properly offered, I must emphatically state that ever since the Civil Service Reform was introduced under Cleveland no Government official of the United States is to be bribed. Up to that time, I grant that the charge of bribery might have been sustained, and this was only the natural result of the order of things that then

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

prevailed. First, it cost considerable influence, money, and work, to obtain an office; and the certainty of remaining in its possession depended on the chances of the political party then at the helm. According to the Jacksonian motto, "To the victor belong the spoils," a regular cleaning out of all Government positions was then the custom, the victorious party bringing their own men to fill them. Therefore, owing to the probable shortness of the tenure of office, and the considerable cost of obtaining it, "contributions to the Campaign Fund" became the time-honoured formula. It was only human, after all, that the official should meet half-way the generous public, so anxious for his personal welfare.

However, the Civil Service Reform put an end to all this, as an official would lose a generously-paid position, if caught in anything like favouritism or bribery.

I do not claim any special disinterestedness or virtuous stoicism for the American, but, to give the devil his due, they surely are keen enough at *reckoning*, and no man of sense would risk a secure, well-paid appointment for life, for the sake of a few extra dollars. Thus, the accusation made in this

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

regard, appears merely to prove that one has to pay even for past sins.

Civil Service Reform implies a competitive examination, open to all, and varying in its requirements according to the duties of the special office. No diploma, 'varsity or honorary degree of learning is of any help to the candidate; he has to pass his examination with the others. Neither do the examiners themselves know whose papers they pass, since numbers alone are employed, the highest being appointed directly, the next in order being kept on record as candidates for the first vacancy.

The parallel with the Russians cannot well be treated of here, on account of its irrelevancy. Still, I may mention that the educational system in Russia, according to which a university or high school degree entitles its owner to a Government position, is one of the chief causes of corruption, since it fills the high schools and 'varsities with men bent on making a career, instead of real students in pursuit of knowledge, thus lowering both the sense of public morality among the cultivated classes, as well as the standing of the seats of learning. The smallness of the emoluments of the lower officials has also to be remembered, and if

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

we consider in conjunction with that the well leagued and organized body of the commercial venturers, in the majority of cases of Oriental origin, who certainly understand how to use the rouble officially, the solution of the riddle is not far off.

CHAPTER VIII

THE following Counts, VII., VIII., and IX., I propose to treat jointly, as the issues implied are by nature closely allied.

Count VII. : " American statesmen are almost invariably without education and are self-made."

Count VIII. : " American foreign politics are slippery."

Count IX. : " Their public life is vulgar and hysterical."

In regard to Count VII., I admit that America has been productive of few brilliant drawing-room diplomats and finished courtiers, who could even approximately compete with the galaxy of European masters in that domain. But the serious question arises, whether such accomplishments are really to be taken as a criterion of the statesman, and the reply is easily made : No, since for a good half century it has been out of date, and

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

practical use—ever since that brawling and over-bearing Pomeranian Junker cut a new swath in diplomacy by directly declaring what he meant and what he wanted, producing thereby a regular panic in the diplomatic circles of Europe, and puzzling his antagonists, who, of course, did not believe him at first, as, according to their prototype—the brilliant Talleyrand—“*La parole a été donné à l’homme pour déguiser sa pensée.*”

The era of diplomatic Court intrigues, in which the ladies had such an ascendancy as to call for a special type of man, *de salon*, has passed irretrievably.

Serious economic issues, on which the welfare of nations depend, have come to the front. A thorough familiarity with the resources of one’s own country, not as to products and means alone, but as to the possibilities of its men as well, a hawk’s eye to perceive future issues and their nature—all this is required to-day. In a word, a wide-awake man, too engrossed with his work to waste time on exteriors, and too much of a business man and student to waste it on ornamentals, is the type of man in whose hands the country’s interests are safe, even if he might not meet with the

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

approval of the leisure classes and society Lions ; and that type of man is certainly more likely to be found among those whom nature and their work have provided with the diploma of *Self-Made*, than among those who are made by others, the best 'Varsities included. Even if very talented the latter would not have the profound knowledge possessed by the self-made article. A glance at the foreign business of the United States is more than sufficient to show that our uneducated men, with some kind of acquired gumption, have managed to navigate the national barque a great deal more successfully in the interests of their country than most of their accomplished colleagues on this side of the Pond.

There was certainly no Crimean War phantasia with us ; no losing of men and money for the purpose of warding off and spoiling one of the best markets for the commerce and industry of the mother country, forcing the whole into the hands of the only dangerous and powerful competitor—the sole actual benefit England reaped out of the famous venture. Neither did we ensure future danger and troubles for ourselves by making offensive and defensive alliances with the Asiatics

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

against the white European race, resulting in the glorious "Asia for the Asiatics"—a far from felicitous motto, seeing that the 300 million British subjects are nearly all Asiatics. We did not get scared by the phantom of a capital R, and take it for a G casting that shadow.

Besides, United States statesmen might have been anything you please, the whole world over, since they certainly did their duty. But I happen to have known two of our ambassadors to England personally, and a third quite well, though by repute only. I refer to John Biglow, also our ambassador in Paris, and Andrew White, of Cornell, the third being Mr. Choate, one of the ablest and best known men of the New York bar. Certainly all three were thoroughly cultivated men, and widely different from the type quoted. I am sure that any English gentleman who may have met them, will agree with me that these American statesmen were of as refined and cultivated types as any country can produce.

Then, in regard to United States inner politics and men at the head of them, the evil encountered here has been alluded to already, and its sources pointed out, and it has also been explained

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

by what historical causes it was produced. I remember, very well indeed, how two election processions passed under my window in Gramerey Park. One, that of the Republicans, was splendidly equipped, with hundreds and hundreds of gentlemen from down town in the marching lines, exchanges and wholesale. They were well drilled, too, as they kept splendid *alignment* and time. Then there were the Democrats, if possible more numerous and equally presentable, with this difference, perhaps, that the majority of them were good Irish types of the better class. The Republicans swung in from Lexington Avenue to the right, going towards Fourth Avenue, and, simultaneously the Democrats were coming from Irving Place, swinging also to the right towards Third Avenue, so that the two antagonists passed each other at a half-block distance only, remaining in sight of each other for a good twenty minutes or more. I stood on the balcony, and was greeted by several of my acquaintances from among the Republicans, and actually hardly trusted my eyes and hearing when, of a sudden, one of my friends—one of the largest cotton mill owners in North England, and a most accomplished gentleman—

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

sang out aloud "Pa, Pa, where is my ma?"—a kind of shady story against Grover Cleveland, who was then elected.

Then came the answer, in a mighty chorus from the Democrats, also in marching time: "Blaine! Blaine!—the—Greatest—skin—of Maine! The continental liar," and so forth, the Republicans continuing to march to their "Pa! Pa! where is my ma?"

I confess I felt shocked, declared personalities of the kind to be a miserably cheap article, and said as much to my friends, getting nicely laughed at. "It's election fun," they said, "nobody takes it seriously, and if some objectionable things appear in the press, it is not difficult to obtain redress from the Courts. People at large cannot grasp the real issue at stake, but notice personalities; therefore personalities are often used to give life to the whole, creating public interest. Besides," they added, "once you figure as a candidate you are common property, a thing publicly discussed, and you have to foot the bill of the public honour offered to you by taking your part of public abuse like a man. If it does not suit you, do not get nominated."

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

I still persisted in my previous views on the subject, and thought that trait to be barbarous in American public life, until the Fates made me spend a number of years in Germany, where I met with the same uncultured election procedure as in the United States. I heard it and read it—gross personal blackmail, produced in the same way, only with less good nature and apparently in full earnest.

Then again I found it in the columns of the *Novoje Wremia*, as quotations from the Orientally progressive Press in Russia: the wildest abuse of some of the best and cleanest men in the country, mitigated since on account of the heavy penalties imposed by the courts. Finally, I found something like it in good merry old England, so that finally I came to the conclusion that this not over-refined feature in politics is far from being an American peculiarity, but rather due to the unpleasant necessity of awakening the election beast in man in order to drive him in the proper political path. As a matter of personal taste, I would rather side with the Hungarian whose election and agitation speeches used in olden times to be made on the commons, outside the zone of danger to the balance

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

of the public, and where every candidate came in with a few wagon loads of wine, temporary bars being erected near his tribune. The voter, whose interest had to be awakened, came, listened to the speech, and tasted of the grape, and generally voted for the candidate who had the best wine. Of course the chronicler says there were a number of broken heads after the election. What of it? Better broken heads than injured characters, I would remark.

However, this I must say, I hardly think that all the American vituperative speeches and personalities compare with the sight of a statesman of the realm mounting the tribune to incite one class of people against another, in, let us put it mildly, very unguarded and unparliamentary language. This, indeed, beats America to pieces, with all the "Pas" and "Mas" and even "Continental liars," which are considered hysterical.

And now a few words about the hayseed rural politics, which, as I have said, had remained American and never lost their Yankee spirit, even before the last phase in the land politics brought its best men to the front, with the advent of the Republicans to power.

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

The way of managing the political "food for the cannon" has been mentioned by Mr. X. and Mr. Y. ; now let me introduce the reader to a brick-yard and cement mill potentate up the Hudson, in the State of New York, on whom I happened to call shortly after one of the great State elections, with one of my young legal friends, who had been active in the last contest himself. Our host greeted us very warmly, and we were soon enjoying a huge log-fire, a smoke, and a tumbler of really meritorious article, put before us—drinking the customary American toast after an election, "To the best man, gentlemen."

"Well," said our host, speaking with a very pronounced nasal twang, "we certainly had a nice monkey and parrot time of it, didn't we? But all told we are O K in Albany State legislature."

"Yes, Mr. R.," answered my friend, "but X. is still the Boss of New York city."

"And why should he not be, Mr. H. ? He is the only man who can keep the Irish element in anything approaching order and discipline, and the only man, for sure, who can do something half way decent with the masses of the Orientals on

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

the East side or the crowds of macaronis and organ-grinders. Without full autononomical development of the local centres, there is no security for the whole, gentlemen. That's the way I read my Constitution ! ”

“ Well, well,” I allowed myself to remark, “ it certainly was local autonomy you fought against in the 'sixties.”

“ Right you are,” I got for an answer. “ I have read the like in print myself. However, it was not meant that way in the constitution of the country, because between our last political motto, ‘ Every citizen in the United States ought to know why he stands for the United States,’ and the issue of the 'sixties, ‘ Every state has the sovereign right to decide for itself whether or not it remains within the Union,’ there is all the difference in creation ; and what I claim is just this—had they at that time adopted our motto of to-day instead of abiding by the opinions of the leading minorities, there would have been no war.”

“ Well, Mr. R.,” I said, “ I suppose each time has its own necessities ; and I am fully aware that we are in the very midst of the rule of the great majorities, with all the blessings that implies. But

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

how you can deduce a local autonomy from it, remains a mystery to me, because there is but one way to represent the interests of any local centre successfully, 'The best man to the front.' Thus, the initiative of action remains in his hands, and naturally we reach the leading minority once more. If we do not, we have the old story of the blind leading the blind."

"You are certainly not an American born," was the polite rejoinder, "or you would know that the blind born, or blindly educated man, is also forced to an insight of things with us, if he has any desire to continue his existence and not perish. Furthermore, our people are not very prone to have their horse sense knocked out of them by foolish sentimentality. Such a thing has been made impossible by our very constitution, which provides for the free development of the individual and for an automatic rearing process of a strong and active minority. But we must remember, gentlemen, that 'a man's shirt is nearer his skin than his coat,' and that is exactly what I mean by insisting on the wide rights possible of the local centres in matters appertaining to local interests. Constitutionally, we enjoy a government chosen by ourselves, for

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

the Executive, the Legislative, and for the administration of our affairs, therefore the 'best man to the fore' must remain our national motto, on the realization of which the whole structure depends. Why, a band of rascals at the helm, when understanding each other and well organized, is far more dangerous than the most inhuman despot. That type is soon put aside and done away with, so long as the national group is strong and healthy; but we cannot so easily get rid of the others. They take root and cannot be disposed of except by strong contra-organization and strenuous work among the voters of the country."

"But your strong work and organization can have only one result, namely a passing hypnotic influence on these masses; and what is it, that you expect to achieve with such an ephemeral factor? If you intended to storm a bastille or cut down the opposing faction root and branch, I would not say that it might not work—but otherwise?"

"Well, about your famous Bastille I have read something, though I reckon it was not half so glorious as our own Bunker's Hill. As to your other thing, the hypnotism, I guess you called it,

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

well, I know pretty damn little about it, except perhaps that the women folks are the most dangerous at it. But if by the whole of it you imply influencing the votes, then I would say that it is perfectly constitutional, allowable and absolutely all right. Of course I do not mean the high moral preaching and the conversion of sinners by it. No, sir, 'The shirt is nearer the skin, than the coat' that's all. Any autonomic centre is sure to send its best men to the front, even if to get so far every citizen of the community should have to stand losses and considerable trouble as a lesson in the management of public affairs—that is, to become personally conscious why he should vote for the best man."

"But, Mr. R., what could you do against a small number of, say, rich and smart fellows, who, taking advantage of your local autonomy, conspired together to exploit your centre for the benefit of their own pockets? They could easily get things into their own hand; in fact, such occurrences are passably frequent, and it is the duty of a strong central government to put them aside."

"Not my opinion, young man. Sheep are there to be shorn, and also to supply our table with chops

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

and legs of mutton ; and you will not find one single clause in our Constitution, that would make the shearing of sheep unlawful, though there are plenty that would make the changing of a given centre into a sheephold a rather difficult task. Anybody can apply to court for relief against administration, free of any costs. But I am principally against any interference with the acts of a local administrative body, as I am of the opinion that it is exactly through personal loss and damage that the citizen is forced to take an active part and interest in public affairs. Besides, that is the best way to make it clear to the masses that the very safety of their own hides depends on the security of the whole. This once thoroughly understood by the people, we have means on hand to discipline the leading minorities, making them stronger thereby. The best man will then be elected, not on account of his capacity for oratory and the elastic and illusive abstract notions propounded by him, but on the strength of his proven personal merits and efficiency, and according to the exact need of the moment."

"You must excuse me, but this sounds something very similar to the paragraphs of the Massa-

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

chusetts Bay Colony, according to which only men of a certain property qualification could vote or be elected. In other words, when the common security was synonymous with the interests of the voters themselves as regards the property they owned."

"And fully in the right have these Yankees been, notwithstanding all the big talk and the many legal points raised against them ever since."

"On what grounds, Mr. R. ?"

"Because the Constitution gives the vote to everybody, and in doing so confers on every man the privilege and right to stand to attention, to defend the institutions of the country, and to contribute his personal mite of work towards the common weal. But the Constitution does not imply that the voting privilege should be used as a weapon of destruction by the very enemies of that common weal. That would be simply absurd."

"But how are you going to prevent it ? According to Article 15 of the Constitution, every man born or naturalised in the United States is a full-fledged citizen of the country."

"Certainly so. But as I understand my Constitution, naturalization means swearing off the

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

allegiance to any or all the other countries, and your engagement, under solemn oath, to support the Institutions and Constitution of the United States. Furthermore, born in the United States implies also educated in the United States and brought up in the United States as a United States' man. So it is our national interest and the duty of everybody to see that the new citizens should not forswear themselves, and that all children born in the country should be brought up in the spirit of it. Constitutionally we are bound to do it, as constitutionally every citizen is supposed to be on guard for the safety of the whole. Some time ago I said to my foreman in the largest brickyard, 'John, you have a good head on your shoulders, and understand your business. You are getting 35 dollars a week, which is a darn sight more than your *Raths von* and *zu* are paid in your native country. But let me tell you that here in our United States there is but one *Staat* and that is the United States to whom you have sworn fealty and allegiance. Therefore, if I should happen to hear that you have been propounding and explaining that *Zukunft Staat* of yours to my workmen then you will simply fly, that's all. For, if you care more for the *Zukunft Staat*

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

than for your own, then you simply gather your *Genossen* and go, say, go to Liberia to establish your *Zukunft Staat* there.' ”

“ Well ? ” quizzed my companion, “ and what did John say ? ”

“ He was somewhat bluffed at first, and even attempted to argue that, as a United States citizen, he was entitled to his personal opinion as well as to the free expression of it. But I quickly caught him up with the question, Would he suffer somebody inside his house to entice others to destroy it ? ‘ Certainly not,’ he replied almost angrily. ‘ But, John,’ I queried further, ‘ if it should happen that one of your mates who boards with you started persuading the others to burn the roof of your own house ? ’ ‘ *Sacra Die,*’ he exclaimed, ‘ Let him try it and I’ll kick him half dead and chuck him out of the window.’ ‘ But how can you, John ? Why, that man would but have expressed his own opinion. And now, John, I reckon we understand one another. If you remain what you have sworn to be—a citizen of the United States—we shall continue to work together, peacefully and friendly, and I shall see that you always get paid exactly the amount you are worth to me. Should you, how-

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

ever, insist on making the world happy by playing the socialistic agitator, and but once more come out with your *Zukunft Staat* among my workmen, then, John, thou wilt fly ! You are doing worse than inciting the others to burn the roof over my head. You are inciting whole bands to set fire to the land that has received you and yours hospitably ; the country that has made you happy ; the very land that gives your children a chance to become anything and anybody in it.' ”

“ And John ? ” I asked.

“ Oh, well, John was honest. He told me that he had never looked at the thing from that point of view, and that he would now think it all over and certainly would not go behind my back in the meantime, as long as I myself treated him as a man. So then he asked me for some time to consider.”

“ And then ? ”

“ And then, in less than a fortnight, he came to me, declaring that he now knew that it was I and not Herr Most who was in the right. That, after all, the whole thing was merely bosh,—just as his frau had told him long ago. Further, that he would like to learn something more about the constitution and history of the United States, and would I not

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

recommend some good book to him, because he could read and write English already ? Of course I made him a present of the books he wanted, and since that time it is he himself who looks after the economic convictions of the men ; and I can safely say there is not one single socialist among the several hundreds we employ."

"But, don't you think, Mr. R.," I objected "that the moral persuasion you have used with your foreman could be put under the heading of your money or your life ? Because, if John did not have his thirty-five dollars a week to lose, who knows whether he would not have continued to side with Herr Most after all ? "

"Right you are. That's exactly my doctrine. It is the only doctrine that can be used with the Johns to bring back their runaway heads to the consciousness of our sober conditions of existence. And let me add that these men are far from being bad. On the contrary, many of them possess the right kind of stuff to make very desirable citizens, even if they should continue to wander off into their clouds from time to time. Then it's for us to give an energetic command. And no sooner do the fellows do honest work and see that any extra

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

effort on their part brings in extra money, than they become thoroughly reliable and soon begin to find pleasure in their occupation and work, just like any one of us born Americans. They then study, improve their working and earning capacity, and find more pleasure and enjoyment in their improved conditions than in their previous sky-scraping, especially as it pays better."

I have quoted Mr. R., sometimes called *Constitution Jim* by his friends, as he is fully characteristic of the spirit prevailing in the land, the true material out of which the *Man of Deed* is made in America. Mr. R. was the son of a farmer up the State, and had very little schooling. He very early began a sharp and enduring tussle with fate and fortune under various grades of longitude and latitude in the United States, before he became the influential R. with his brickyard and cement mills, enormous landed property and whole blocks of houses in the adjoining towns. They dubbed him Constitution Jim, as it was the Declaration of Independence and the articles of the Constitution that had been his first and only mental food when a mere farm boy, just beginning to think and reflect on things while alone in his field, following the plough, or hoeing

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

his corn. In fact he saw everything and judged everything by his fifteen articles of the United States Constitution, which he knew by heart and construed in all possible ways, broadly enough, to guide him correctly in all his doings. The welfare of the "Common Weal" was his Alpha and Omega in life

CHAPTER IX

COUNT X. reads : " Their treatment of the negro is more brutal than the Greek or Roman slavery." In answer to this really appalling statement, I shall merely assert that there are no laws in the States giving special privileges to any race whatsoever ; outside of special regulations concerning Chinese immigration, there is hardly any room for the poetic version of the Greek and Roman slavery.

But there are certainly racial conflicts with the negroes to-day, as in times past there were local feuds with the Italians (New Orleans and Louisiana) ; and, previously, continual encounters on the Mexican border with the *Greezers* (Mexicans).

But a short retrospect shows us the darkie to be the true *bête noire* of the northern Yankee, ever since slavery became an institution in the South. The cheap labour that at any time could threaten the North with competition, besides making the Southern States economically independent, raised

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

their tobacco, cotton, rice and corn (maize), and encouraged a general trading with England, instead of a patriotic patronage of the northern home industries. In this economic struggle, fought out on political grounds, the darkie plays a prominent rôle, as he forms the best material for agitation among the masses of the population, and is made capital of on all tribunes, where his case is advocated in the name of all the humanities. In reality, however, it was once more the case of "Pa ! pa ! where is my ma ?"

Of course, there were many actual cases of cruelty, especially in West Virginia coal mines, where thousands of poor ignorant Hungarians and Poles were handed over without any knowledge of conditions, all tied up and legally bound—not one of the poor chaps understands a word of English—by their enterprising naturalized countrymen, the labour contractors. These poor fellows used to be disciplined and treated a great deal worse than the Southern darkies, until, in conformity with the theories of Constitutional Jim, misery forced gump-tion on them as well, and they started to assert their individual rights legally, and not by violence, as they repeatedly had done before, when they also

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

got even more than direct relief, seeing their former oppressors legally traduced and heavily punished. This is an order of things that might be somewhat foreign to ethics, but at the same time is practically conducive to bringing out the qualities of the individual to his personal, as well as to the public, advantage.

As a general rule, especially among planters of English descent, the negroes were very rarely ill-treated. On the contrary, an almost scientific care was exercised in the rearing of the most contented and vigorous specimen, and this not out of any extra humanitarian sentimentality, but simply on the basis of strict business, a happy and well developed negro being considered twice as profitable and valuable as an ill-treated one. Some of the old Virginia and Carolina planter regulations for the management of negroes would serve as models for the modern municipal regulations of the white man, especially in regard to the breeding of healthy and sturdy specimens of our own race. In truth, the planters' interests lay in doing all that is so sadly missing in the present provisions of our famous civilization for rearing our future generations or even taking a hygienic

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

care of our own existence, many down grades instead of ameliorations of our human species being the result. Among the Spanish and other descendants of the Latin race this was not always the case, however, and many cruelties are actually on record ; though even here one can trace some of the interested *northern-indignation-meeting* style, when reading the accounts of them. But I remember several instances among older darkies in Virginia, who refused to have anything to do with the modern innovations, and called themselves "the niggers of XYZ," for whom they were ready to continue to work, and by whom they expected to be fed, and otherwise decently taken care of. All these *ante bellum* details have been given to me repeatedly by gentlemen who owned enormous plantations themselves, and were as trustworthy and humane types as could be desired. Since then, however, the darkies have become not only free, but also a grievously objectionable mass element of the population ; and this not in the old South only. In the city of New York the police always have extra trouble in the negro quarters. With his political rights in the State, as well as in local affairs, the negro is often a regular stumbling-

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

block to his old master in the South, and a terror to the white women as well, a fact which has called forth the lynching atrocities. When discoursed upon, from the pulpits especially, there is no doubt that the thing is really horrible to listen to, as horrible as the short work that John Bull made of some of the dangerous Hindu elements. But, outside of the pulpits that teach us the higher life, there is the brutal reality confronting us, the necessity of living all together, before aspiring to the higher life. As a matter of fact, no serious student of ethnology will be found guilty of the grievous mistake of which the pulpits and the eloquent crowd of humanitarians are generally guilty, namely, putting the negro on a level racially with the white man, even though equal rights are given to him. The negroes so far remain an over-emotional and impulsive race, almost void of individuality and personal character, and, when turning to beasts and running amuck, they can be subdued only by fear ; and the white man of the South, being inferior in numbers in many regions, is forced to organize and even use terrorizing measures for his own preservation, and the defence of his own family.

What educational measures will be able to do

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

with the race, I am not ready to discuss. The negroes unmistakably work well when properly handled, but are found absolutely shiftless, unmanageable, lazy and unreliable, besides being the most consummate liars, when treated otherwise. Politeness makes them simply overbearing, and then but two courses are left to you. You either are forced to call them down very energetically and in a manner that has scarcely anything in common with refinement, or part company for good, getting absolutely the worst of the bargain. Something of the kind I had the chance to ascertain personally and that on several different occasions, when dealing with darkies. Once I was brought almost to exasperation by several dusky creatures I employed, paying a rather generous figure for their services. Then, I confess, I allowed my temper to run away with me, and proceeded to play the judge, prosecuting attorney, and sheriff all in one, using very unguarded language, and offering to break their bones for them and so forth! But I was ready to stick to my word irrespective of consequences, having stood it long enough with Christian patience and resignation. Well, the effect proved stupendous. Instead of

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

rebellion and extremes in conduct, I obtained the most unconditional surrender, and I never was better served up to the very end of the year.

A rather amusing incident related to me by one of my legal friends seems to support my notions in this respect, and will be of some interest for the reader, as John Bull was officially represented on that occasion. This happened to a relation of my friend, a colonel in the Confederate army, who was too heartsore to remain in the Union after the war, and ventured to acquire a large plantation estate near the coast of the Gulf, in the United States of Columbia, South America, whither my friend was also sent to investigate some gold-mining interests. Barring the climate, really dangerous for a white man, the country seemed to be most promising. The barns and shades and the majority of the buildings encountered were generally built with solid mahogany for timber. The soil was everywhere fertile enough to yield the most luxurious crops, for mere scratching; and untold mineral wealth was found in abundance, awaiting only man's industry to yield the most generous returns. But the inhabitants were too lazy to be induced to work. They were amply

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

satisfied with the mere sticking of a few shoots of banana or bread-fruit tree into the ground, and lived on the produce with their llamas, happy and contented, without caring for the beauties of civilization. In fact, the railroad across the Cordilleras had a dangerous competitor in the llamas express, which passed the mountain chain by a trailing path with their pack-saddles full of goods, delivering them frequently ahead of the railway. Taking all this into due consideration, the Southerner, who had some good old Virginia blood in him, decided to get some negroes from Jamaica, as the white man was sure to contract the Chagres fever in that region unless perfectly acclimatized. Accustomed from his very childhood to deal with darkies, the colonel did not expect to encounter any difficulties with his new Jamaica contingent. He certainly paid them well for their work, and was especially careful about their feeding. This was generous indeed. He had a number of overseers, who were also men from the South, and understood their business well, even if they were perfectly devoid of any squeamish prejudice against corporal punishment. These fellows had the bad taste, not only to carry their whips, but also big colt

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

revolvers with them. For several years, everything went swimmingly, barring a few instances when a little bodily punishment of the negro was considered necessary. However, exactly these small incidents came to be reported to Jamaica, and a war vessel was dispatched to land and investigate the case of British subjects reported to have been flogged. The captain found the place, landed his forces, and at their head called upon the colonel, demanding an explanation from that gentleman. But the Southerner, extremely glad to see a civilized man's face for the first time after long months, refused to talk shop before his guests were duly received and treated with old Virginia hospitality. The negroes were given a holiday, and the best the plantation could afford was served to officers and men, the darkies also receiving their share. A full supply of spirits was also allowed, considering the danger of the Chagres fever for the white man not accustomed to the climate. In the hacienda, the gentlemen had a couple of hours of friendly and hearty converse, and had just arrived at their black coffee and smoke, when the captain, fully conscious of his duties, began the interrogation concerning the pesky subject of his mission. This was not done

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

entirely in the shape and form the colonel considered proper, and both parties waxed somewhat impatient and warm, the Englishman speaking of the inviolability of a British cutaneous membrane, even if coloured, and the colonel claiming that he knew his own business too well to be lectured about it by anybody. Furthermore, that a nigger remained a nigger, British or otherwise, that he could not be employed to any advantage without firm discipline. Nobody knows how the thing would have ended, as both gentlemen were growing angry, when of a sudden their altercation was interrupted by a terrible clamour and noise outside. They seized weapons and rushed on the verandah, only to find the negroes and sailors at each other's throats, and, what was still worse, the negroes—enormous picked fellows—had armed themselves with bludgeons and spikes and were getting the better of the Englishmen, several of whom were lying stretched on the ground struck down by the darkies. The colonel's active assistance was asked by the captain at once, and the old confederate soldier had no trouble in quelling the disturbance, with the energetic help of his overseers. A number of darkies, who had been the most active in leading

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

the attack on the sailors, were thrown into chains and offered to the captain as a brotherly peace-offering by the Virginian. The Britisher, however—once more the correct gentleman—refused to take advantage of the generous offer of the colonel, and insisted on having him keep his men, providing he would give his word that each of the blackguards should receive a solid cowhiding. This the Southerner promised, out of courtesy, and of course kept his promise faithfully, like a true Virginian gentleman. Thus, I am told, ended the international episode.

That there is considerable good in the darkies I am the first to acknowledge. They are kind-hearted and brave. This they have proved in many instances. Nobody knows, for instance, how many of the Roosevelt Cowboys' Regiment would have returned from their charge at San Juan, in Cuba, but for the beautiful and recklessly brave support of the negro regiment behind them. But the psychology of the race is perfectly infantile, and even with the best of them it is not the training of one generation that will change it. The educational activity in this direction has to accommodate itself to the material to be educated, on the lines of the Virginia Hampton Institute

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

working with the Indians. A general schooling of the average white population type in the United States will prove a failure, as it proved a failure with the Indians, and even with some of the immigrant masses in the East.

Besides, it is not the darkey alone who needs strong discipline to make him do his work well. I have observed something very similar among the Italian labourers on the New York and New Jersey railway line, where I once saw a railroad cycle pumped for dear life by a number of Italians, and one typical Celt standing leisurely among them with a clay pipe in the corner of his mouth, busily swearing at his men in a most horrible manner. Interested in the sociological kodak before me, I asked the station-master of Hackensack for an explanation. He informed me that the railroad company experimented with Italian labour, and found it A1, on condition, however, that each gang had its foreman responsible for the task; and Irish bosses were the best. The workman who worked got paid one and a half dollars a day, and the boss who swore at him the whole day long two and a half. This is a case of the suppression of individuality for several generations.

CHAPTER X

WE arrive now at the consideration of society and of social aspects. In the face of the powerful indictments brought against him under that heading, poor Uncle Sam, who for several generations has supplied his better half so generously with hard earned cash "to do the social act in the proper manner," might indeed have good reasons to regret having married off his many fair daughters to foreign nobility at the expense of heavy dowries, instead of choosing the direct descendants of the rightful princes of the land, the chieftains of the Indian nations, even if the Sioux and the cruel Commanchees had been left out of serious consideration, and the choice been limited to the original five nations of the East, as being more humane and more civilized. And yet it is exactly in the direction of social crystallization that Uncle Sam would by right have a great deal to say.

Before proceeding with the special points of criticism, a few general considerations, underlying

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

the issue, are in place, bringing down the whole question to the realistic basis of the greatest good of the group, and the better chances for the development of the individual.

A social culture tending to depreciate the human material of its devotees, so far as the natural strength of the breed and its life possibilities are concerned, must *ipso facto* be declared a failure, as the kind of education was found to be which hampered instead of advancing the true possibilities of the individual's existence. Then the old issue of the proper standard is again before us, with the necessity of choosing between the *National* and *International* as the ideal of society—the two being found conflicting. In this respect, I uphold the *National Standard*, even at the risk of passing for a barbarian. One is dealing at least with a genuine article, even if apparently inferior to the foreign import, and one is exposed to less danger of meeting with the perfect surface *vernish*, only concealing an unwholesome core. It might be justly claimed that there are no short-cuts in cultural work, and certainly an absence of the famous “*Accommodations avec le Seigneur.*” It is a slow uphill struggle of whole generations, a process of gradual growth

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

and development of the human mind, attended by the unavoidable necessity of passing through a series of well defined phases of understanding and feeling, before the real cultural haven is reached by man. Moreover, higher social culture, being but the superstructure of the well developed individual and group capacity to live, implies the perfect solidarity of that individual with his national group. Actually he derives his very emotional elements of superior notions from his personal connection of interests and feelings with those of the group. Therefore, in becoming international, he also grows sterile, by losing hold of such elements, and habitually ends with the mere worship of the correct exterior. It is true that Humanity, with a big H, still remains, but *Qui trop embrace, mal étreint*. The highest of cultures cannot resist the inexorable laws of creation, and one of those is the "struggle for existence." The necessity of means to live bars internationalism so long as it pleases Dame Nature to distribute those various resources that are needed by everybody in different centres, creating *a priori* local interests to be safeguarded, and establishing the true basis of the nationalism of the future, if the historical

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

and traditional one should be destroyed. Besides, every one of us does not carry his ego as his only burden through life. Unless reduced to a neutral pap of an amorphous nature, devoid of individuality, a real case of *de-civilization*, he is also burdened atavistically with a number of progenitors' peculiarities. The greater part of our actions and impulses are not conscious, but reflex and almost automatic, representing to a great extent the racial group inheritance of the individual, and entailing an undesirable conflict when we play at being citizens of the world. A conflict between our conscious intellectual international aspirations and our semi-conscious instinctive national predispositions renders our achievements actually inferior to our possibilities, since they are the resultant of two forces working on one and the same body, but in different directions, instead of the joint sum of both acting in the same direction. Rationally, then, the national type of culture is found to give the best results with the least waste of human energy. The individual achieves most when his conscious and sub-conscious mentalities are in harmony and not in conflict with each other. But the same holds good for the national group as

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

well, since it is found that the cultural needs and aspirations of national centres must vary a great deal in conformity with the conditions of existence. Therefore, even the highest of them are destructive to commonwealths not ready for their reception, but struggling in different stages of group developments.

During the Crimean War, the Russian soldier declared, "That what was life to a Russian was death to the Frenchman," as he saw the poor French prisoners die by the hundred, when fed on the Russian black bread ; but the simple-minded *muzyk* did not dream that the reverse was equally true from the national cultural point of view. The appreciation of French and German notions, habits and ways, as well as ideas in Russia, was deadly to him and his brethren, who were not ready to receive them ; and it took untold suffering and losses to the whole country to make the lesson self evident. However, even accepting the national standard, one is still puzzled for a nearer definition of it. Old Europe passed through many turmoils before the different groups of her citizens were duly mustered as to their various natural endowments, pigeon-holed in classes and dignities.

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

Bureaucratically viewed, the scheme had its merits, and but for the uncalled-for interference of Nature it ought to have worked well. Every fellow in the land had the work of his life cut clear and sharp before him, namely, that of doing his best, so as to reach a higher social stratum. The proletarian became a bourgeois, the bourgeois a nobleman or knight, the financial matador a lord. This, naturally enough, gave to many a born lord the vivid desire to be reduced to the common soldier's ranks in which his clan had begun its ascent of the social ladder, sooner than remain in the new company that certainly had anything but the characteristic traits of his own breed, and out of whom, notwithstanding official titles, even the Lord Almighty could not make a full-blooded creature.

In times past, then, the best social standard was evidently that of the highest society, and this embodied the social group of the highest caste or class, the standard of intercourse, its manners and ways were the thing, the only true article, and all that other classes could reasonably do was to come as close to it as possible. The majority of the often so ridiculous fashions originated in that way.

So long as the old device of the nobility "*Chaque*

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

baron a sa fantaisie” was kept uppermost, there was little to object to. The right and freedom of courageously asserted individual independence was implied in it, and to feudalism it is that humanity at large owes the commencement of the greatest advance on earth in a human creature, namely, individualism striving after higher personal ideals. But as soon as aristocracy itself became a bureaucratic institution of the realm—as in France, for instance, when its members began to vie with each other for the honour of helping His Majesty to his slippers or undergarment at the levée—it lost its cultural significance by losing its character; and the compromise with the men of shekels disindividualized aristocracy made it but another stratum of higher respectability, instead of, as before, the vanguard of the often turbulent and crazy, but always courageous and sincere, idealists. Further, this stratum of respectability is absolutely equal to the others, except that it is generally less endowed with practical abilities, and is often even weaker in personal character than many strata of Commoners who have forged their way through life by their personal energy, persistence, and often really superior brains.

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

But while the old standard of nobility implied an extremely hard training of the young, and heavy military service subsequently, it required full proofs of personal valour and merit to be produced before the young man was allowed to join its ranks on an equal footing as a knight. But his notions and opinions were his personal privilege, respected by others, so long as he remained true to his duties and obligations ; and any fellow of good blood and courteous demeanour was received socially on a perfectly equal footing, irrespective of his fortune.

All that was soon changed with the forced compromise. A new nobility was rapidly pushing to the front, *Noblesse de Robe*, who were certainly different and antagonistic to their exalted predecessors. They differed from them in so far as they were superior to them in cunning, and a great deal inferior in personal character. They soon obtained an ascendancy over them, with the memorable result that the motto of the past *Noblesse oblige*, which then meant readiness of every one in the clan to sacrifice himself and his belongings for the welfare and good of his commonwealth, became gradually changed into a mere obligation of correctness of form, and the clinging

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

to certain elementary æsthetic notions in regard to social intercourse. Then individuality gradually disappeared, its place being taken by the collective opinion of the group, and the inner value of man became an object of enquiry only after he had passed muster as to externals.

However, as it was impossible to cultivate the delicate æsthetic shadings of the correct and refined without displaying it, and the display called for the cash to do it with, *cash* became the first consideration. For it not only the cultural necessities of the refined gentleman could be procured, but to it also that gentleman's conscience and principles were found to accommodate themselves. After all, so long as there was but one kind of existence worth living, namely, that of the higher society—" *Après nous le déluge* "—men with great historical names bartered their only heirloom for the ill-gotten, but still potential, cash that came with a girl whom they would not have even looked at, but for her dowry. Others, occupying places of responsibility and influence in the swim of higher society, used their influence and prestige to procure decorations and even titles for some astute financier in return for cash. Again others, whose ancestors

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

had sacrificed their lives and fortunes in the service of their country, made bargains with oriental swindlers, giving them army and navy contracts, knowing well that the heavy commission they were personally receiving was part of the money of which the country was cheated. But then without the necessary cash, how could they maintain their proper position in conformity with the regulations of the select society of which their fathers used to be the masters ?

This out of the annals of some of the highest modern fashion-giving society. In opposition to which apparently, though bending and bowing before its genuine, if degenerate, representatives, there then came class No. II., including many shades, of course, but generally dubbed *the men of culture and education*, with the rich and powerful bourgeois in the van ; unmistakably smarter and more far-sighted than the surviving *bona-fide* nobility, but certainly inferior to them in personal character. (One has to keep in mind that England was the only country in Europe which provided for at least the pecuniary independence of her higher Chamber by the strict laws of primogeniture and entail.)

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

More conscious of the real power and importance of cash than the others, they are always ready to acquire it without suffering in the least from hampering ethical or æsthetical prejudices. “*La poudre aux yeux*” being the professional maxim of the *noblesse de robe*, as well as a trade necessity of the commercial article in the predominating speculative direction, it was only natural that the medium for the gilding of the exterior should here be found of more vital importance than with class No. I. Thus their highest social standard became external correctness, so useful a mantle to cover many unattractive features. However, as this alone could not possibly impose upon the antagonists above, with whom it was generally atavistic and perfectly natural, art and æstheticism were called upon, with a well-defined tendency towards bringing all the remaining features of the hated aristocratic past into thorough popular discredit.

Personal valour and intrepidity were suddenly found to be mere animal courage and brutal fighting instinct of the soldatesque, a mere rudimentary remnant of the barbarous age luckily past. The sincere expression of notions and ideas was regarded as brutal and uncultured, as it tended to obfus-

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

cate the delicate feelings of others holding opposite views. Even a man's principle to stick to his word and promise, and demand as much from others, was called uncivilized. "We are ruled by circumstances," and accordingly a gentleman might change his mind. If you wanted it safe and secure, why did you not have it put down in black and white legally? In art and the realm of intellectual production, not the merits of the work itself, its subject and the way it is handled, but the haphazard success and mass recognition of it, are the chief object; and the mystical and obscure collective "*We*" is generously used as a final verdict, saving the trouble of going into particulars, as a squasher and damper of bothersome argument. Science, as pure unæsthetic materialism, is ostracised, of course, and in literature the light crispy thing, the spicy element that the cast-iron regulations of respectability will not allow us to live through and personally experience, are the thing. Life is too short for problems and issues, "*Après nous le déluge.*"

I am far from asserting that the pictures thus sketched cover the social intercourse of every class in any land, and so much less in England as I

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

know England only from my association with a large number of Englishmen abroad. (Not quite the same as the Englishman at home.) On the contrary, it would seem to me that, as the traditional individualist, John Bull, whose *men of thought* helped me a great deal more to work out my own notions than those of other nationalities, would be the last not to attend to his own affairs in his own way, I might almost surmise that many of his lords would keep a highly correct and respectable butler as the perfect image of correctness, and indulge their lordly privilege of old hunting coat and disreputable leggings, as well as other lordly privileges of being a natural man; that they would remember, too, that their ancestors made their country what it is to-day—the leading power of the world—by strength of will and sturdy character, and not by suavity, diplomacy and tricky compromises when dealing with an enemy abroad or in the interior. But what I claim is that such lords, and their parallels among worthy commoners, are not the organized and disciplined society, not the fashion plates and editors of the journals of ceremonies, and therefore I consider them as merely detached individuals, living a free life, under the

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

constitution of the country, without being at all ambitious to make the social marionette perform her gyrations. Therefore, it is only the general tendency and direction to which I have referred, and which I have sufficiently studied and observed to get somewhat of a distinct idea about.

And now, coming to the subject itself :—

Counts XI. and XII. read : “ Americans are de-civilized, having no manners.”

Let us plead guilty to the first part of this. Judging from the generally received European standard, they must be so declared, with the exception of a few coteries of the *nouveaux riches* who are busy experimenting, I suppose, on how many foolish things a man can do with his money. Indeed, Americans, as a whole, are a pushing, questionable crowd, full of self-assertion and personal whims not sanctioned by any of the organized types of societies which I have been trying to characterize. They are also unorthodox enough not even to recognize the full value of the Russian dictum though sanctioned officially even in Germany, “ *Tshin tshina potehytaiet* ” (one official rank honours itself by honouring the others), and this for the simple reason that the United States are yet

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

sufficiently barbarous not to recognize any *Tshins* whatsoever, and because in that barbarous country a man relying upon his ancestors instead of standing on his own personal qualifications and merits would be considered a lunatic. But if civilization means an order of things aiming at a sound growth and improvement of the whole country by the process of direct selection of the best human forces and abilities found within it—and this is certainly implied in the country's motto "Free for all"—then indeed the picture might appear under another aspect; that of busy Uncle Sam, looking at the deportment of the leading European social circles, wasting their forces, abilities, and money in doing naught but the social marionette performance, while the organized discontent below, massing forces and threatening the whole, impairs national solidarity. Then in truth might the de-civilized American mumble to himself in his uncultured Yankee twang: "By Gosh! What darned fools ye mortals be," and address a fervent prayer to his Creator to keep away that kind of civilization from the shores of the United States.

As to manners. Evidently it is not for the purpose of becoming slaves again, that we have

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

fought hundreds of years to obtain that greatest boon of civilization, the right of personal thought and judgment and action within the limits of the law. As it is, however, etiquette and mannerisms have multiplied, and together with other equally powerful dicta of Dame Society are threatening us with a worse slavery than the historical ones, infinitely more dangerous to the progress of humanity, as it destroys every vestige of individualism or personality and kills spontaneity by careful scrutiny of every word a man says, or even motion he makes of the body.

If for no other reason than the safeguarding of elementary æsthetic notions, a distinction between manners and mannerisms has to be strictly made. Just imagine a man weighing twenty stone entering the drawing room with the mincing step of the old French minuet, and performing *le grand salut* ! Or, consider, especially in a crowded room, the modern handshake with the elbow up, one of the most affected things I ever saw. Or, once more, the now prevailing fashion in Germany of taking off your hat at every opportunity, swinging it with a gracefully rounded *moulinet à seconde quarte*, fencing motion ! It would almost appear as

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

if people living under a constitutional form of government were to be entitled to some leeway in this direction in harmony with their own notions and tastes, and still remain unaccused of having bad manners, since good manners are after all incompatible with mannerisms ; their standard being that of simplicity and not ostentation. The standard of good manners is certainly that of perfect naturalness, especially as the greatest social attractiveness always consists in making manners express the natural temperament, and in giving at once a certain cachet of personality to the individual—providing of course that such display remains unconscious. But the important question arises whether, for instance, it would be bad manners to eat your rice with a fork or a spoon, instead of the regulation chopsticks, when you happen to be in China ; and this calls for investigation.

Leaving aside the historical signification of most of our customs, manners, and ceremonies, a subject that Herbert Spencer has so masterly treated, one would understand by manners some regulations of our intercourse with our fellow-men, aiming at making that intercourse as easy and agreeable as possible ; and in this sense, bad and

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

vulgar manners will have a deeper significance than the mere outside form, the questionable vocabulary used for emphasis, or the uncouth motions of the body endangering a superb collection of Sèvres curiosities, let us say. They have to be judged in the light of the real definition of vulgarity, which consists in the wilful disregard of others' rights ; and in this relation I find the average true American twice as delicate as the average of the very well-mannered, but otherwise absolutely coarse, individuals of higher social standing on the Continent. An old story is told of a meeting of two tired travellers at some small inn on the highroad. One of them is supposed to have come from the island of John Bull, the other to have been a Frenchman. After an evening meal together, but without the exchange of a word, they sat down in front of the fire, to smoke. After a quarter of an hour the Frenchman tapped John Bull on the shoulder. " Monsieur ! " he exclaimed excitedly, " Take care, your shoes are steaming." " What's that to you ? " responded the ponderous Briton. " Why, you damn fool " (they used to be emphatic in those days), " a good part of the skirt of your coat has been roasting away for the last

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

ten minutes, and I did not disturb you. It did not even cross my mind to disturb you." I confess to the crudity of the illustration. Still, it allows me to draw the line. The decivilized American would say, "Let the duffer alone, as long as he is not inclined to be sociable, this is his right and privilege under the Constitution of the country ; besides the poor chap might have something worrying him. But do not allow him to have his shoes destroyed, as they enter into the inventory of the possessions for which all the country has worked."

CHAPTER XI

COUNT XIII. reads: "America has no high society. The wealthy live in hotels and trains, the moderately rich in wretched flats."

When the draft of a constitution for the Carolinas was considered in England, Locke, the philosopher, was asked to contribute to it. His scheme embraced the creation of over a dozen grades of nobility, personal and hereditary. These were to be chosen very carefully, and the administrative and executive powers were to be entrusted to them. But the obstinate colonists would not hear of it, though there was considerably high French blood among the descendants of Coligny's Huguenots. The Dutch patroons up the Hudson, in New Jersey and North Delaware, fared similarly. They had no time to take root, as a feudal institution in the United States before the Duke of York put an end to their privileged existence, capturing New Amsterdam for the English Crown, together with all the territory belonging to it. While a hundred

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

years afterward the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the new political power put an end to all differentiation of officially recognized ranks and privileges, derived from the past.

Thus, historically considered, the crystallization of the European No. I. centres at the head of society with their official gradations, was made impossible in America from the start. Equally, there was no chance for the organization of the European No. II. of the educated, with the rich bourgeois in the van ; firstly because the typical *bonhomme* with his *poudre aux yeux* and his *maître d'hôtel* correct respectability had not succeeded in coming to the top in America, remaining generally in his own natural level—that of *parfums*, *chocolats*, *bonbons*, and table delicacies ; and next, because the very term “educated” had hardly any weight in a country where any chimney sweep or shoe-black has a chance to obtain his learned degrees in any of the State universities, free of charge, his personal expenses excepted (though he does not increase his money earning possibilities thereby, as the business Yankee does not habitually think much of a college graduate in business, unless he is a professional, and the man at the head of public

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

affairs makes him pass his civil service examinations before he considers him). Add to this the instability of American life—to-day in New York, next year in Michigan, or again Florida or the Pacific Coast. Then there is the whirling and intense activity going on in all possible and impossible directions. Finally, there is the absence of clan solidarity and that of the Uncle in the Consistory, whom I have already mentioned. Thus it becomes natural that Society, in the European sense of the word, should be found missing ; even if the higher standard of man and women, openly declared to represent the aim of such an organization, should be fully kept up. This standard is probably maintained with even more care in America than in Europe, for, accustomed as he is to find his real enjoyment of life in a restricted circle of friends and intimate acquaintances, the American is extremely careful about their selection. If anybody, it is he, who is exclusive in that respect, though, of course, he is often obliged to do the social act out of mere business considerations. To see clearly this distinction in his social activity, it is sufficient to have been present at one of those big receptions, that almost everybody gives once or twice a year

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

officially "for his constituents," as the phrase is in New York, "constituents" implying business, political and professional friends and acquaintances; and afterwards to attend an At Home, or a dinner party with a small number of really close acquaintances of the host. Gorgeous jewellery, overdress, loud voices, thronged rooms to the point of actual difficulty to squeeze through, discomfort, champagne, costly refreshments and fatigue, characterise the first, though there is also a good opportunity of seeing and meeting everybody in town. The most exquisite entertainment with persons of really good taste, delicacy of feeling and manners, also often persons of great personal achievements, is equally typical of the other.

That smaller or larger circles thus formed, let us say, on the principle of social affinity, are numerous, can be easily imagined; but, though really representing the true and genuine social element of America, just exactly because they are genuine, they are also the last to compete with each other for ascendancy, or to be quoted as special values on the social market. Such an element, however, does not only exist in full resplendent evidence in New York, Washington,

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

Newport, etc., but has its full organization—tailors, caterers, decorators and even reporters—besides taking up all the time of a number of well trained editors, who sacrifice their brilliant talents to naught else but social events, frills, frocks, and the like. In fact, since good McAllister organized his four hundred many years ago, their number has probably outstripped the famous ten thousand grand council of the Venetian Republic of the times of the Doges. But it would not be quite fair to the country at large to take these exquisites to be the real American Society. Genuine American Society is not organized, but is purely individual and select, and as refined as that of any genuinely higher circles in any country; but, perhaps for that very reason, it is not at all ambitious to organize, as evidently the old lines of the Higher Society are hardly to be sustained in our modern age, and the new lines are as yet far from distinct. The only clear and distinct suggestions in that direction are that the duties of the real higher society of the future will be too serious and manifold to leave much margin either of time or of attention, for gaudy display, ceremonies, or the mere regulation of æsthetic correctness. In fact, the old motto of

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

“ *noblesse oblige* ” is sure once more to become the device of higher society. The historic “ *Ich dien* ” will have to be revived, and mean, “ I serve the higher interests of my fellow-men in the country I call mine.” This implies considerable preparatory work, especially for the higher society.

CHAPTER XII

THE following Counts : XIV., XVI., XXII., XXIV., I shall treat jointly, as referring to the American home and home life, as well as to that enigmatical creature, the American woman, of whom so many contradictory statements have been made in the past, and continue to be subjects of comment in the present. The criticisms in this direction are certainly not mild, but are probably due to unfamiliarity with the subject, to the Yellow Journals of America, and to the unhappy habit, seemingly popular on this side of the pond, of judging a country of over eighty millions, and nearly ten times as large as Germany, or over two-thirds the size of all the British possessions, by some of the Americanized types which happen to be amply met with abroad. These people, who are Hershko or Moshko in Minsk, Pinsk or Kukstehoody, are metamorphosed into Robinson, Harrisson or Paulsen after their arrival in the States ; and under these apparently good Anglo-Saxon names bring

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

their adopted country into discredit by their extra-typical behaviour. To change your name in America all that is needed is to apply to Court.

Count XIV. reads : " American women are sexless, silly, and expensive."

Count XVI. : " American morality is Puritan in appearance, but licentious in fact ; marriages are unstable, men and women licentious."

Count XXII. : " Americans have no appreciation of personality. They are potentially equal, consequently there is only insolence among the inferior."

Count XXIV. : " Americans are inhospitable."

Let us begin with the woman.

To give a composite picture of the American woman is no easy task. The homogeneity of the material, which would allow one to follow it in the various stages of development, is missing. Moreover, the utterly different, almost antagonistic features of the early homes have to be taken into account, as well as the varied conditions of existence, to the powerful influence of which many a distinct psychological trait can be traced. However, I will give first the position of women as to legal and social status : the woman in America

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

is recognized as the equal of man, and in some respects is legally even more advantageously situated than man. She administers property in her own right, without any marital discipline or restraint, without accounting to anybody, while her husband remains responsible for the debts she contracts, and is obliged to support her even if separated ; while she still remains joint claimant to his earthly possessions and retains the testamentary right to one-third of his fortune at his decease. Politically she enjoys the property vote throughout the Union, and full political rights in several States, electing and being elected to and often occupying official positions, especially in the west. All professions are open to her throughout the whole Union. She can become lawyer, doctor, scientist, or even minister of the Gospel ; commercially, she monopolizes whole branches of business activity ; and educationally, she is strongly represented in the high and normal schools, and is in the majority among teachers of the lower grades of public schools, equivalent to the former board schools in England. Socially she has a number of women's clubs, where things are said to be lively, and where wicked man is only a guest on

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

special occasions. But to fully understand the psychology of the American woman, accounting for the many traits that make her a distinct type, some of the historical factors must be considered to which the evolution of that type are to be ascribed. Her emancipation from the hard lines of discipline dictated by the ungallant apostle Paul, was not brought about without hardship, and was fully deserved. First came the Puritan *régime* in the eastern States, stern, unrelenting discipline of the woman, evincing full conversance with the fact that it is to her that the loss of Paradise by man has to be attributed, that loss being due to her perverse taste for prohibited apples, and her downright wickedness in making poor Adam share in the fruit.

I certainly like the Hindu version of this memorable event a great deal better; there the woman is more womanly and Adam more manly.

One cannot help admiring the inventive genius of the Yankee, clearly demonstrated in this period by his contrivance of the ducking-stool on the Charles River, in which those women of the community who treated their lords and masters with too much back talk, and quarrelled too much, were

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

officially installed for immersion, being asked after the first plunge whether they repented and were ready to mend their ways ? The chronicler reports, however, that at that time several immersions were habitually required to make these ladies change their minds. Neither was home life very attractive then, the rule, for the woman especially, being hard work, scant fare, and very long prayers. But revenge is sweet. Exactly from that epoch date certain pies and doughnuts, which, prepared by the woman, have made many a masculine one repent, even up to our modern times, his transgressions against her.

Going further south to "Old Virginee," the Carolinas and Virginia of to-day, we are confronted by an entirely different picture. The gay Cavaliers predominated here, and real joy of life was experienced, notwithstanding the hardships and dangers to which the settlers were continually exposed. Besides the official festivities, in the official seat of Government, regularly given by the representative of old England, the arrival of ships from the mother country formed the most joyous event in Jamestown, many an unmarried settler even from the far away backwoods not failing to dress himself in

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

his best togs on that occasion. He had built a home, had promising acres of maize and tobacco, and went to Jamestown in the hope of securing a wife for his home, as he now was well-off and could afford such a luxury. Many a vessel brought a cargo of strong, healthy, pretty girls, whom the colony agents in England had persuaded to go over and select a husband among the English settlers in want of a wife to take care of their homes. It was the chosen one who paid for the journey expenses of the girls, generally in tobacco, forty pounds being the habitual charge. That many of the poor chaps afterwards regretted not having smoked their tobacco themselves is self-understood ; but on the whole it cannot be said that the tobacco was wasted, since the feminine element thus brought into the country was possessed of the chief qualities then indispensable for the welfare of the settlement, namely, personal courage and determinedness of character.

Armed with an old flint lock, or even simply with an axe, the Virginia woman often defended her blockhouse against the Redskin or some white man equally dangerous. She did not shirk work, and ruled with an iron rod in the household which

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

she often had to manage alone—not an easy task indeed if one remembers that a good part of the working forces of the settlers consisted of deported convicts whom the Government used to lease out. Then, again, in the woolly West, the process by which the woman obtained her full equality with man is no less instructive. Here she is the only and true mistress of her rough home, which stood somewhere in the midst of the green and endless prairie—all white with snow in the winter—and often an enormous distance from any other human dwelling. She is the wife of a cattle or sheep raiser, and the mistress of a ranch—a home often destroyed by tornadoes or even by a prairie fire. Her duties are manifold and not easy—steel muscles, a sure eye and practised dexterity in the use of a gun are indispensable, and she is actually obliged to feel as much at home even on the bare back of a mustang as any man, since upon a forced ride the life of her dear ones as well as her own often depends. For her husband she always remains the only true source of happiness, the bestower of consolation, encouragement, and joy; while she generally has that rough, quarrelsome, strong, reckless and desperate giant of a cowboy in full

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

subjection, practically under her slipper. In the gulches and cañons, in the wild gold and silver mining camps—that other source of national wealth as well as extensive field of national labour—the picture is not very different. Free mining communities have been organized on state territory, and have staked out their claims. Here groups of all possible kinds of adventurers and cut-throats are to be found, and the autonomic regulations of the community are ideally simple and effective, since, after the official warning, the transgressor against the holy rights of other people's property, or the perpetrator of other sins against the community, is simply suspended by his neck, and his anatomy perforated by the well-aimed bullets of his fellow-men. Here we find the woman the true object of respect and solicitude. She is protected by every one, and bad luck to the one who would dare to insult or hurt her in any way. There is sure to be a funeral on the following morning, the whole community listening to the sleepy speech of the chap whom they have invested with office on account of his long-winded diction and general loquaciousness. When the post coach, drawn by the regulation four or even six mules, arrives,

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

handled over thick and thin with an expert skill unknown anywhere else, it is met by loud and joyful cheers. But if women are expected with it, as often happens, all the unmarried men of the camp make themselves as presentable and attractive as they can. A collection is taken, each one contributing his mite of dust, and a fund is raised to give a proper feast to the darlings, generally in the only meeting-shed the camp can boast. A few fellows, endowed with superior musical taste, give proofs of their gifts by playing a tune on a Jew's harp, a harmonica, or even a violin. Then a dance is started, the health of the darlings is drunk, and, as an expression of genuine delight, a playful discharge of revolvers indulged in. Naturally enough, every newly-arrived girl is courted at once. But here, also, strict regulations prevail. Equal chances for everybody is the rule, no special favours or facilities are given. It is the girl who decides and makes her free choice. The unlucky men take their defeat philosophically enough, they consider it a matter of course, and continue to be warm friends of the new couple. The strong but ugly sex is equally oppressed here, and often really tyrannized over by manners, etiquette, church-

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

going, and other things of that description. Man, however, is a creature of habit, and prone to bear patiently what he cannot alter. On this characteristic depend the very elements of the fatalism that is as conspicuous in America as elsewhere

So much for the past. It points to an automatic process of selection of an energetic and vigorous material "with plenty of nerve," let us say, in the woman as well as in the man, and also accounts at the same time for the fact that that type succeeded in dominating the more numerous new arrivals.

In the primitive conditions of existence in the early days of the States, nature took good care to eliminate weaklings and the otherwise unfit, without giving them the chance to propagate their defective breed, as civilization is wont to do to-day. It must be remembered, too, that some of these rough conditions of life continue to exist, in many parts of the Union, breeding a robust and self-reliant strain of men, sending forth many of their young forces to take part in the general game of life played in the country. In fact, judging from the work of such types, one is almost ready to assert that in an encounter of brawn and the best trained

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

brain, the brawn is a sure winner. The brawn possesses more grit and endurance if nothing else, and gets the better by sheer determination.

My studies and observations in this respect would almost lead me to the conclusion that rural districts and backwoods are the storehouse of national energy and force, and that upon the sturdiness and natural life of her backwoods population the future security of a nation depends. From that point of view, the United States are certainly secure, for the further one gets away from the coast and civilization the better is the type of man and woman encountered ; and unquestionably the Michigander or the Kentucky breed can easily compete with any other racial strain, even though there are energetic encounters with desperate smugglers in the first, and frequent fatal fights with the moonshiners (illicit-whiskey-stills owners) in the second case.

All told, the native stock is healthy and strong outside of the over-populated city centres. Love marriages prevail among them, and healthy, bouncing children are the rule. The woman of the lower strata is also found to be a true mate of the man. She works hard and keeps her brood,

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

and her husband as well, in perfect order. She has no bodily or mental hepatic complaints, seems satisfied with her existence, and does not hanker after the luxuries of the *millionaires*, a term denoting a millionaire who is supposed to follow up a special trade and profession—that of the *millionaires*.

However, the picture changes somewhat in the city centres. The “man to man” principle, the very essence of the rough backwood life of the country, is very apt to be reconstrued into the more civilized version of “the dollar to dollar,” and a man is actually obliged, if in any way anxious and concerned about the welfare of his earthly possessions, to make his way very carefully through huge crowds of ladies and gentlemen, before he once more encounters—to his great relief—the sympathetic type of the manly man and womanly woman. The majority of these are found on top. They are men standing high in their professions, the heads of great commercial and financial enterprises, or representing the political interests of the country, but they can scarcely be said to be in the swim. They have no time for social masquerades, though, of course, one meets them at the Receptions for the constituents, or other unavoidable social

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

functions : that is, the men, because, as to the women, it is exactly here that their most interesting activity begins.

However, before following her ladyship in her many ventures, a typical characteristic of American social life has to be noticed as explanatory of many points, otherwise apparently incomprehensible to the average European. It is the absence of the clan, as far as the family is concerned. In Europe a man with family traditions cannot help being clannish, nor can he free himself from his entourage and connections. If he be a representative of some trade or profession, he can hardly escape the pressure of traditions characteristic of his special group. The contrary is the case in the United States. High or low, a man stands alone, absolutely by himself, his family being generally limited to the filial, parental, or fraternal relations, his cousins even being almost strangers to him, and his friends and associates are of his own choosing ; and, changing his place of living repeatedly, as is almost always the case with an active man, he seldom goes beyond a very hearty but infrequent correspondence with them. He often ignores his connections, or is ignored by them,

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

when striking out some new mode of existence, whether permanently or temporarily only. But he continues to take the liveliest interest in public affairs, and, acting up to the principles I have already touched upon, he continues in his ambition to raise his business activity to the height of a public interest. I know of several cases in which men who have given hundreds of thousands, millions even, for public needs such as infirmaries and schools, and have absolutely ignored their not remote relations, who were far from being opulent.

From all of which it would almost appear as if public interests in Europe were bound to have a certain tinge of class or group interests, the national issue coming in second, a condition of affairs which is absolutely the contrary of what predominates among the leading men in the States. Indeed, considering what the nation at large has received in private gifts from her leading citizens, and especially taking into account the enormous cultural value and real public benefit of the institutions thus created by them, one is ready to declare them to be a type of *practical idealists*, rather than the money-grabbing individuals they are generally

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

considered to be. However, if well tabulated columns of numbers are a real joy to the American, who is fully conscious of their true signification ; if most of them can tell you about the shipbuilding on the great lakes, proving to your satisfaction that Cleveland shipbuilding interests are larger than those of Liverpool, and in fact are the largest in the world barring those of the Clyde in England ; if they can show you that the transport of freight amounted to some eighty-five millions of freight-tons during the last year, and that there are more 600-foot steel freighters launched there than in any other part of the globe of a similar area ; if they further point out to you triumphantly that it does not cost more to transport a hundred-weight of freight to New York from Dacota than from Connecticut ; it by no means follows, nor is even to be looked for, that Jennie should display the same amount of enthusiasm or even interest about the matter, as her John.

But still, by inheritance or otherwise, Jennie is also full of public spirit, and feels as much real interest in the general issues and welfare as her John. It is true she has always found figures a real horror and political economy the greatest of

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

bores among the many educational dishes served out to her in her finishing courses. She, nevertheless, knows about very many things of which John is ignorant. She could give you, for instance, the names and chief characters of any classical work of fiction; is absolutely *au fait* with the last progressive notions and ideas; and very often she honestly believes what many imported apostles of culture, generally hailing from la belle France, advance. She claims that it is the high mission and lofty duty of the American woman to be the true promoter of culture and civilization in the United States. Thus, should there be no children, she is sure to work in her sphere as much as John does in his office downtown.

But, after due allowance has been made for her personal vanity as a woman, the direction her activity takes will greatly depend on her relations to her husband. If more enthusiastic about that individual's person than about his tabulated column of numbers—as generally happens in the great majority of cases, since genuine American stock is yet barbarous enough to believe in *love matches*—Jennie's activity will be largely different from that of many of

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

her acquaintances, and the very opposite of that of the select company, with or without large fortunes, of the *true ladies*. She will do her best to study and try to understand the issues of the day, will work diligently to acquire real knowledge of what is going on in the artistic and literary world, yet for all that will not neglect either her home or her nursery. On the contrary, she will not have any French *bonne* innovation to take care of her brood, but will herself superintend all the details of their existence ; and her " At Homes " will become real moments of enjoyment for a limited number of intimate acquaintances, duly appreciated by anybody fond of pleasant exchange of thought between people of real merit and personal achievements. For a European, chancing to be present at such reunions, it is a real revelation to observe what depth of solid thinking, broadness of views, and far-sightedness as to the actual trend of things in the world at large, those apparently self-taught American men of business possess, such being among the few occasions on which they speak freely their opinions, and lay aside all restraint. If John is interested in politics, possibly active in Washington himself, he finds the most adroit helpmate in his

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

wife ; she will canvass for him a great deal more ably than the smartest lawyer, and be sure to convince the influential public which she addresses of the full merits and value of her husband's measures. Then their house in Washington will become a staunch pillar or dangerous opponent of the Executive of the Capitol. In fact, Jennie takes to politics like a fish to water, and as a woman she can risk many things that John could not dare to risk as a man. As a matter of unvarnished reality, many well-known names in Washington, with whose doings all the country resounded, owed a good part of their success to the ability of their Jennies.

This kind of woman is easily distinguished from the select lady, even in exterior appearance. They never try to eclipse creation by their toilets, and are never seen in the street in anything but the simplest and least striking apparel. Their manner is naturalness and simplicity itself. No wonder then that they are seldom counted among the fashionable clique, though many of those glittering butterflies would go any length to be on intimate terms with John and Jennie. This type, and not the glorious Four Hundred, is the true back-

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

bone of America in the present, as well as a secure guarantee of the country's future.

But, admitting that Jennie had imagined marriage to be entirely different from what she found it, and that she had accepted John only on account of the high esteem he enjoyed in her circle ; that it was a case of temperament after all, and that John's tabulated figures had made her disgusted, not only with business, but with her John as well, especially as there were no children to give her a new interest in life ; admitting further that John was too busy to notice the danger coming, and that he simply set his lower jaw more firmly and proceeded quietly to work twice as hard as he worked before ; and that when he saw the danger neither of them cared to take advantage of the legal possibility of changing their position, but bravely decided to make the most of a poor job by increasing their public interest at the expense of their private affairs, in which, egotistical as it may sound, the greater part of their life capital had hitherto been invested—then, indeed, Jennie's activity becomes widely different. She is then fully convinced that " All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy " ; that the Almighty did not

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

mean it that way ; that He did not create us to wander through life in solemn earnest, with the whole of our mind bent solely on the hereafter ; that he did not give us youth, strength, beauty and a sensitive impulsive temperament, to be wasted in growing old, wrinkled and grumpy ; that, in short, *fun* is as much a necessity in life, as food, drink, or sleep ; then, fun will Jennie have in plenty by becoming a brilliant society woman and playing the game for all it is worth. She will become quite an authority on French salons, and possibly even dream of becoming a power in her own, which she will work diligently to fill with all possible celebrities, both foreign and indigenous. Thenceforth will etiquette and society regulations become really influential with her, and she is sure to patronize some conservative church, and from time to time, probably when noticing poor John preoccupied or tired, she will have some compunction about her new doctrine of *fun* or the German *Ausleben*, an æsthetic modification of the time honoured “ wild oats ” notion. After having listened to the preacher’s elocution on Sunday about the ephemeral nature of things temporal, she will seriously throw herself into

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

missions and charities, to re-establish the ethical balance. She will establish *crèches* for the tots of the women at work ; evening schools for shopgirls ; supply sterilised milk for babies at cost price ; provide hygienic underwear for the negro children of the African missions, the most approved type of nursery-bottle bibs for the Mongolians, among whom, she will tell you, “ there are such terrible famines, reported by the missionaries, that the mothers cannot nourish their babies, who have to be brought up on the bottle.” The whole of this proving conclusively that she never had taken any stock in John’s tabulated figures. In fact, Jennie, the true womanly Jennie, in the higher sense of the word, is lost, and in a fair way to become a *mere society lady*. Unless——

But should John meet with heavy losses, and, as is customary with the true American, be once more on the point of starting afresh in life, then, indeed, blood tells, and Jennie forgets all about “ her ladyship ” and becomes a true woman again. A brief explanation with John and the poor fellow is surprised to find what a treasure he has had in his wife all along, without ever suspecting it. He is simply astounded at her ability, her

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

exhaustible resources in pushing things forward, and her ability to use all her social connections with an eye to business. He discovers daily some new advantage she possesses. In a word, it is often to her that he owes his renewed success and the final winning of his new battle.

But Jennie also, now that she has become intimately acquainted with John's work, has equally changed her mind in regard to it. She sees now, for the first time, the greatness of the task her husband had been busy with. She clearly perceives its importance for the country at large, and how, upon such productive work, above everything else, the very possibility of progress for the future generations of the country depends. When enjoying a couple of hours' rest after dinner, according to the stern prescription of the doctor, either in her boudoir or in the library, and when, as customary, John has lighted his pipe—the very briar she had for years condemned as the most plebeian, absurd and horrible looking thing, but with which she now in some way or another sympathises—Jennie looks furtively at her companion, as he pensively gazes at the glowing embers. Astounded, she scrutinizes his pensive brow, the well chiselled,

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

earnest and energetic face, the strong jaw, the large facial angle. She compares him with the spick and span, carefully groomed and eminently correct figures of the masculine butterflies of the drawing-rooms, men glib of tongue and fertile of calembours, men who not long ago had formed her court and whose attentions she had received very graciously indeed, why, she cannot now understand. She realizes that they all were nothing but empty puppets in comparison with John, and she suddenly gets up and almost startles him by giving him a big, hearty, almost plebeian hug.

And, indeed, he might be astounded, as from that moment his Jennie has descended in the social scale, and has become his womanly woman, renouncing the other thing for ever.

But the reader will probably interpose at this juncture. "All your Jennies are assumed by you to embody Gibson's types of American beauty. Do you really mean to assert, sir, that a woman of plain appearance is bound to remain a spinster and be thoroughly ignored by the breed of your famous Johns with their foolish notions about love matches and the like? And I beg of you, what

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

chances does a plain woman have to play the society star, say, as a source of consolation in the case of matrimonial wreckage ? ”

I have to deal with such a prolix subject as the women of a country.

You are perfectly right. Society stars are by the very order of the social Mufti pre-ordained to be beautiful ; but the satellites of the stars are so much the more valuable the ungainlier they are—the more the attractions of the stars are rendered in evidence by contrast. It is a noticeable fact that beautiful women are fond of their very ugly sisters. And as to the other query, it may be said that, granting a woman not to be deformed, but, on the contrary, well built and healthy, she has a fair chance with John anyhow, because John himself is certainly an oddity. He has seen life, and knew a thing or two about women before he decided to marry, after having worked long and successfully enough to afford it. John, then—a fact that is generally passed over very carelessly by the European when considering the American species of Johns—had for some time before, for years probably, been busy building up a woman type within his imagination ; actually he had it all

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

complete within him, when starting on the errand of realizing his dream and finding his mate. Probably, he had had quite a glimpse at society as well ; had passed all the society beauties in review, all the creatures who serve as the non-paid models of the Worths, the Paquins, the jewellers and the expensive modistes, and he had probably proved the correctness of his good old mother's saying : "Beauty is, who beauty does." Besides, John had also met some real women among the ladies to whom he felt sympathetically drawn, though they were neither the prettiest nor the youngest. He had then become a psychologist, and slowly the truth had dawned upon him that the chief beauty of a woman consists in the expression of the features rather than in the features themselves. The features taken alone can be indifferent or even repulsive, though perfectly classical, when betraying a low nature hidden beneath. Not so the expression, however, that mirror of the soul within ! So John might have decided on expression for his standard, instead of a merely *pretty face*. This is only an hypothesis, of course. Still, generally speaking, Americans are practical men, and expression lasts, increasing in beauty even as

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

years advance, while the prettiness of faces is of considerably shorter duration, if the expression from the within is missing.

Admitting, then, for sake of argument, the not pretty spouse of John to be disenchanted with matrimony, and, on account of her homeliness, incapable of aspiring to the "starring" rôle in society ; granting her sufficient pride and ambition to make her disdain the notion of playing the part of a satellite to a star among her friends ; she will indeed look for pastures new, but her case will be found a great deal more complex than that of the previous Jennie. From her childhood up, she has been treated as the *Cinderella*, not only at home, but also in the school, and in society. She has always seen other girls preferred to her, though she well knew their real worth to be inferior to hers. She has actually begun to hate pretty faces, and has stored a certain amount of gall within her. The old rancour is now stirred up afresh when that brute of a man follows suit and begins to treat her with a superior indifference, which he certainly would not have exhibited, had she possessed a pretty face. The poor creature forgets the while that exactly her unreasonable sensitiveness and

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

continual aggressiveness have probably been the very things that have driven in the matrimonial wedge.

“ Well, then, men are certainly brutes !—Women horrors ! ”

But after all it is not their fault ; they are, what men make them—men who would go any length after a pretty doll-face and weigh in a chemical balance the claims put forward by a real woman.

In fact, the whole of it, as it now stands, is an unjust and foolish arrangement—from top to bottom ! Material development indeed ! as if a human being could exist on matter alone ! Men have had it their own way the whole time, and have made a perfect failure of it—failure of which she, Jennie, in her 5th Avenue mansion, is as conscious as the poor wretch of a girl in the slums who passes a good part of the night sewing her rag bags.

With women having their full political rights and especially getting hold of the administrative departments, the thing is sure to change. It's evident that the average woman always sees things more quickly than a man. She herself has often seen many things ahead, of which John had not even an inkling. But, without full political rights, how

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

could woman get hold of the administration, and apply her really superior intellectual forces? Result—Jennie No. 3 becomes a well pronounced suffragette. She now spends most of her time, money and energy, for the cause and in the movement. She works like a beaver; never misses any of the important meetings of the numerous clubs of the progressive social rebels; and becomes more and more convinced of the correctness of her notions, when listening continually to the eloquent exposure of all the evils caused by brutal man. She takes a leading part in the interests of the professional women—lawyers, doctors and politicians—in the societies for the protection of her sex against all possible dangers and losses real or imaginable; and, of course, she is also a strong advocate of co-education, as she fully believes in having the brutal man taken in hand from the very start and converted into a civilized human creature, through the refining influence of the superior feminine mind. Of course, when getting into some quandary, in the midst of her public activity, or “getting stuck” as the boys would say, it is to John and not to the professional woman lawyer that she goes for help and advice. But then, what

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

are these men good for anyhow ? One must certainly avail oneself of all possible means for the good of the great cause !

How many such Jennies are found on the rampage it is not easy to say, as many of them do not wait for the disappointment with John before they enlist in the ranks of the “ Sorosis,” otherwise “ *La Féminité guerroyante*.” But I can testify personally to the fact that the majority of the organized sisterhood—I had the chance of studying them at their headquarters at Delmonico’s, in New York, on the occasions when men were admitted—were even more than plain, which, of course, might lead a poor masculine brute to form some, probably prejudiced and erroneous, ideas on the subject. On such occasions, men were feasted with a really carefully selected dinner, as there might be some truth in the old adage about us, as to reaching our benevolent disposition, if not our heart, through our stomach. We really listened very amiably to the full enumeration of all our shortcomings—when lo ! Strassburger patés, as entrées, and then just read this carefully, reader !—only *ice water* ! Well, I thought it might be an oversight ; so I carefully abstained for a few courses, when, ye

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

gods ! there it was again ! real feminine cruelty—a beautiful *fillet de bœuf aux champignons*, prepared as only Delmonico knows how to do it in New York, and (mark that well, reader !)—ice water again ! I must say I have met with much cruel treatment from women, but my “Sorosis” dinner I never forget.

CHAPTER XIII

HOWEVER, my three Jennies, typical as they are, will not suffice to give a correct idea of the *social ferment* caused by women, if another group of often serious and earnest public workers is not touched upon. I shall denote them by the term—*Women Idealists*.

Many really attractive and interesting types will be found among them, women of higher intelligence, who, being fully conscious of the various shortcomings of their *entourage*, make the work of remedying it their self-imposed task. Taking for their point of departure that, inasmuch as man has his hands and brains full with the productive development of the country and the creation of the means of existence, it behoves woman, as her due share of activity, to make that existence more enjoyable by taking advantage of all the enormous resources in art and progressive ideas which civilization puts at our command. In this way a noble and charming little woman spent almost a lifetime, besides a

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

great fortune, in a finally successful endeavour to provide New York with its first really effective American conservatory of music—an institution open to all comers from different parts of the Union and helping even financially real native talents to a musical career. It is to the personal, unrelenting activity of the same woman that the initiative of the American opera (the old Academy, New York) is due; that the first free concerts were given to the public by the best orchestra of that time, that of Theodor Thomas; that a large number of artistes were helped to name and fame; that the first American school of ballet was organized; and that the city of New York, in the seventies really barbarous so far as music was concerned, with German brass bands galore and lady orchestras and inferior artistes from Europe as stars, has gradually risen to the high rank of one of the musical centres of the world, with splendidly equipped facilities for professional study and training, and one of the best paying and most attractive stages for all the great artistes of the globe.

It was a highly cultivated and talented woman, again, who organized the Artists' League of House Decorators, with some of the best known talents

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

at the head, creating a new breadwinning branch for hundreds of young forces flocking to the Metropolis in search of an artistic education, and earning their support during their time of study by working at designs for wall papers, carpets, curtains, rugs and other articles. This institution contributed not a little to enable that part of applied art in America to work out its own original taste, instead of being tied down to the mere production of foreign model designs. A number of well-known ladies, again, organized "The Women's Exchange of Work," with the stores attached to it, where various home-made articles, besides home-made preserves and various dainties, were sold. This enabled many an impoverished woman creature, not only to gain her livelihood, but very often start anew, with a well paying enterprise, so long as there seemed an ample market for her goods. Women, too, thirty years ago, were at the head of the crusade against the white bread—which London is so exercised over now—and by their concerted action helped a practical advocate of the cause to launch a variety of whole-grain meals of cereals, which are now a staple in America, used by everybody, and especially given to growing

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

children. Once more it was women who started the cooking schools in connection with the girls' department of the public schools and worked out the problem of cheap and wholesome nourishment. There is, briefly, not a single department or direction in which you do not encounter serious minds among women, bent on doing something of real benefit to the public at large. As is natural, many of these ladies are so thoroughly convinced of the overwhelming importance of their pet hobby, as often to meet with anything but blessings from officials and private individuals, whom they happen to get hold of; nevertheless, the fact remains unchallenged that they have greatly contributed to the creation of better conditions of existence among thousands of their fellows, even if some of us had to pass through *un mauvais quart d'heure*.

Personally, I shall never forget the case of a spirited young lady, the daughter of the then Mayor of New York, who, regardless of the roughness of her culprit, stuck to him and forced an unwilling police-officer to arrest the man, for shamefully ill-treating his horse. She appeared against the man in court and took care that a penalty was inflicted upon him. This is certainly more than

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

the average man would have done, he would have probably taken the loss of time, botheration, and trouble into due account, and reached a negative decision. But here lies the problem. We ourselves need to be pushed into many things worth doing, and the woman is the best agent to do it. It is her emotional initiative which, when put into shape by the automatic logical machine of man, is producing measures beneficial for the community.

Of this, for instance, I am sure, that without the enthusiastic co-operation of the American *Women Idealists* Mr. Berg would never have achieved so quick and brilliant a success with his Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, a society so generally recognized to be of great value by everybody owning stock or animals.

Extra stamina—a distinct racial trait—can hardly be said to denote sexlessness, though I would be the first to maintain that one Cossack in the family is amply sufficient for its welfare. But this is the look-out of the man who marries, and therefore a perfectly private affair, escaping public adjudication; otherwise, we should find ourselves obliged to admit that some of the most illustrious historical figures were sexless. There

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

are Joan of Arc; the glorious Teuton women at Chalons who defended their camp against Marius after the men had been slaughtered in battle; Boadicea; Jeanne Hachette at the siege of Beauvais; the German women of Wittenberg; and, finally, a galaxy of sovereign women, such as Queen Bess, Maria Theresa, or the two Catherines of Russia. Are all these types sexless? If so, may the Almighty in His mercy grant us some more, as they would certainly help to push us on the right path a great deal quicker!

Finally, as to silliness and expensiveness.

The criticism is perfectly just and well-founded, only it does not apply to American women in general, but to a special class, a passably showy article, well in evidence in almost any civilized country, practically an international article, and one of the common evils of modern times. This is the class of ladies, who, in their hurry to become ladies, quietly put *the woman aside*, as a fossil, forgetting, unhappily, that there is no possibility of a real lady without a true woman at the bottom! Fortunately this class, though mostly known because it is showy and pushing enough to advertise itself, is far from being a characteristic American

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

phenomenon. In a few generations it is bound to disappear. From an American point of view I consider it established that the woman issue, like any other, must submit to the leading principle of any human aggregate, namely, "the greatest good of the whole." Therefore, it is not so much an issue of principle, as a mere measure of expediency pure and simple. Safety of the whole, ahead of individual interests, is not an abstraction of the inventive human mind, nor the product of overheated imagination, but an imperative order of nature, found to govern the whole gregarious life of the globe. Add to this, the equally potential subdivision of labour, according to the best fitness of workers for their task—a principle equally present in nature—and the issue is found in a nutshell. One needs only to ask what the ultimate aim of the cultural development of man is to be? Is it the cultural nivellization of sex, and the production of the highly refined hermaphrodite; or the highest development of two different types, man and woman? If the latter, we have to expect the further differentiation of the sexes as to their typical qualities, and we cannot reasonably gauge the respective merits or value of each by one

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

and the same standard. Consequently, the issue will not be that of quantity and quality of brains—though even these differ—but *the nature of brains*, as masculine or feminine. Both are of equal value to their group, but in order to bring the utmost good to that group they must be applied to different tasks. Leaving the womanly man and the manly woman aside, as mere refuse products of our civilization pointing to retrogression of the species, and directing our attention to the enquiry respecting the typical masculine and feminine, no special difficulty is encountered in an attempt to characterise the natural principal features of each. According to the historical activity of both, various well pronounced qualities have been acquired by them, which, according to their instinctive predisposition and tendency, might be said figuratively to consist in the tendency to build, acquire and construct, as masculine; to preserve and to guard the acquired, as feminine. This implies the mental and bodily equipment necessary for the masculine constructive and gathering work, be it by means of war, administrative measures and policy, or the competitive struggle in times of peace; strong will, undaunted personal

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

courage, clear perception of general conditions based on an exact analytical knowledge of things ; an imaginative faculty of new combinations, once more with the exact knowledge of the properties of things or their quality as the basis ; and an initiative of well defined lines of action, as the principal masculine attributes. Fair and square, without too great an allowance of softening emotions, must be the basis of masculine ethics, while the higher constructive abstract speculations—as superstructure, so to say the *Mécaniques Célestes* of our existence, equally traceable to a uniform order of cause and consequence—represent the natural domain of our best mental efforts. Emotionally, the interests of the group are the most powerful lever, and the *personal preference* subordinate. In this respect it may be remarked, probably on account of the trained habit of keeping things personal and the comparatively small familiarity he has with the subject itself, a very marked psychological inferiority to the woman is found to predominate even in the strongest and ablest man.

From the beginning of time woman has been the sole caretaker, keeper and preserver of man's

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

place of joy, rest and recuperation, as well as his refuge in distress, suffering and sickness—his home. She is found to fill the holy office of comforter, dispenser of joy, and nurse and provider to the wants of the family. She centres her emotions chiefly on those around her own hearth, and does not have time for the protracted study and minute examination of things; but she sees the direct and immediate more clearly than man, and can jump to conclusions that are very often, if not always, correct, ahead of him. Brought up to early encounter and fight with pesky realities, the minute difficulties and bother of daily existence, she is twice as practical as the man in reference to things within her immediate horizon. Egotistically anxious about her own brood, flesh of her flesh and blood of her blood, in whom she lives her own life over and over again, she is not particularly enthusiastic about the general doctrine of *the fair and square*; instead, she is instinctively full of sympathy for all that suffers and needs help, and her imagination is so much the richer of the two in that she is not limited like the man by the selection of constructive elements of known quality and nature. Moreover, rightly or wrongly,

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

possibly on account of her greater natural sensitiveness, she is less contented than man, and therefore tries to find in the dreamy pictures of imagination the very consolation she misses in reality.

And as to her relations to man, she, who from childhood up has made a study of the animal, has seen him in his weakest moments, and is certainly more at home in the matter, and more capable of discovering undeveloped possibilities in him, which he himself is probably unconscious of possessing. However, she cannot free herself from the emotionalism underlying her very nature when the realm of the higher abstractions and the speculative work of pure reasoning is reached, and therefore is unable to reach the height of impartial judgment, when confronted by general issues, social or political. Her emotions will always dim her vision, and make her partial *towards the weaker and suffering side*. Therefore, so long as our daily existence represents a continual warfare in spite of our poetical aspirations towards higher spheres, so long as, in times of peace, there is a violent clash of individual and group interests, as destructive and merciless as in times of war, and, notwithstanding

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

the use of the cultural weapons aiming at the pocket rather than life, the number of casualties resulting therefrom is found to exceed the number of victims called for by Mars, it is a paramount necessity for the good and even the direct safety of the whole to have the *Red Cross Brigades during the time of peace*. Thoroughly organized and perfected, it would be able to pick up, nurse and care for the present victims of our modern warfare, to give them back strength and courage, and enable them to resume their places in the ranks of honest fighters, in the battalions of toilers and workers. This work, so far confined to private efforts and church organizations, is too important for the nation at large to be left to short-sighted management, as is the case in most countries to-day, which carry on their more or less efficient activity in this direction under the old name of Charity, subdividing at once the citizens of one and the same realm into *Charity Givers* and *Charity Receivers*, where, in fact, not Charity but Right is in question. The right to his subsistence in exchange for his labour, and the right to be taken care of during his days of distress if he has honestly done his share in the ranks of toilers, is a man's inborn con

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

stitutional right, as we should say in the States. This right of man, together with the equalization of chances, is the only safeguard for any national aggregate, to prevent its splitting into contending groups and so endangering national interests by destroying the solidarity within the land.

A new public function is indispensable. A public department is urgently needed to organize honourable assistance in the shape of work for the honest soldier, the modern toiler, taking good care at the same time not to mix him up with the mere marauder of the industrial battlefield, as has been done by combined charities so far. For the marauder, the workhouse with an iron discipline and heavy labour! It is exactly in this department that the woman can do twice the good work a man is capable of. In fact, the range of public activity open to her, where she can bring real help and blessing, is almost unlimited. If only she keeps to her natural *rôle* of the preserving, comforting, and inspiring power of the race. But when entering the ranks of the national fighting element, either in politics or elsewhere, she only loses her chief personal attractions and real power, without strengthening the fighting ranks

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

by her presence. She deprives them, rather, of all the special services which she alone can render, and which are indispensable for the very existence of the national group. Moreover, the chief and a very grave defect in politics is the prevailing and continually increasing emotional and ethical element. Politics, by their very nature, ought to be limited to the most matter-of-fact analysis of things and men, if the economic life and growth of the land are to amount to anything. Therefore, to increase a defect already existing—namely emotionalism—by doubling the amount of that evil is, to say the least, a queer sort of remedy, unless it can be shown that two evils are equal to one good.

The claim of superior intellectual capacity, generally raised, is absolutely foreign to the case and rather against it; as, granting an individual or a crowd to be unbalanced, and incapable of seeing things justly and entirely objectively, then such an individual or body of men will be the more dangerous to the commonwealth, the more highly they are gifted, the most intellectual being the most dangerous. It is not higher abstractions and speculative principles that are wanted in sound and safe politics, but downright “common horse

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

sense.” As it is, we are accustomed to look for poetry and inspiration in a woman ; but, out of gallantry, we do not care to investigate the exact amount of “ common horse sense ” actually at her disposal.

CHAPTER XIV

BEFORE going into the subject of Morals in Count XVI., let us consider Count XV., referring to religion.

It reads : “ American religion is represented by Moody and Sankey or Torrey and Alexander.”

Analogously, any foreigner residing for some time in England might as justly affirm that English religion is represented by the Salvation Army propped up by high ritual, borrowed from Popish Rome. On the surface, such criticism would be certainly correct as limiting itself to the mere statement of actual facts. It would be utterly false, at the same time, as leaving the true issue, the religious spirit predominating in England, entirely aside, and attacking but the surface of things.

American religion is not only Sankey and Moody but many other things as well. We have Popish cathedrals and masses read in them, numerous colleges and seminaries for laymen, priests, and even

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

Jesuits, the Grey Sisters of Charity, the Sacré Cœur in full bloom, and a goodly number of convents and retreats. Then again, all the branches and denominations of the Protestant Church, with their schisms and subdivisions, their special rituals and interpretations—hardly found existing anywhere else—flourish there alongside of Jewish temples and synagogues galore, once more representing all existing variations of the Mosaic Creed, the Cabalists of *Frank?* included, besides plenty of other Talmudic interpretations. Then there are Quaker communities, Mormon organizations of the “Latter Day Saints,” Chinese Joss temples, Greek Catholic churches, with the Armenian and Russian-Greek varieties, Theosophic lectures, Free-thinkers’ and Agnostic Sunday lectures, temple (one only in New York—in my time) of the Comtian Religion of Humanity with several really able men at its head, and temple of Ethical Culture and so forth, Socialism and even Anarchism being duly represented. All of these are absolutely on an equal footing, enjoying a free and undisturbed existence. Each of them has fully equal chances of proving the superiority of its doctrine to the others, and each of them is supported

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

only by the private contributions of its adherents, without any official or in any way compulsory public assistance. Church and State are separate concerns, constitutionally ; and everybody attends to his spiritual welfare in his own way, to paraphrase the really *Great Fritz* of Prussia, who proclaimed : “ Jedermann in meinem Reich soll auf seine eigene Weise seelig werden,” which, unhappily for Germany, has not been strictly adhered to since. The United States sentiment in this respect—of course I speak of the thinking and reflecting minority whom I call true Americans—is, that the juxtaposition of the various creeds and dogmas is equally beneficial to the broadening of the individual, and the healthy growth of the creeds themselves, the different Churches being forced to stand on their real merits, the essence of their doctrine and not the merely exterior ritualistic minutiae. This is bound to forward real humanitarianism, the brotherhood of men worked out on the practical basis of mutual assistance and exchange of kindly feelings, rather than of the strict articles of special beliefs—to unite men, instead of forcing them into an antagonistic and even inimical attitude towards each other on account of their various beliefs.

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

As a result of the modern advance of thought, orthodoxy in all possible directions can be safely considered dead and buried. It could exist only on condition of the suppression of human thought, and a readiness to swallow the whale as well as Jonah. But granting intellectual and emotional discrimination, we have at once to face the indubitable fact that sameness of belief is by itself a grievous misconception, for, to mean anything whatsoever, a belief must be personally assimilated, must become a factor of the individual's mentality and of his ethical speculations, and therefore cannot remain identical with that of others after the process of absorption, tinged as it necessarily must be with the various personal idiosyncrasies conscious and unconscious of the individual. It then becomes sufficiently different in its shadings to serve as a good basis for new splittings of doctrinal hairs. In fact, to secure uniformity there is but the "*credo quia absurdum*" of Saint Augustine to fall back upon, though even that authority has been overthrown by Copernicus.

Thus, looking at the question from that point of view, there will be found two distinct functions connected with any religious work or instruction :

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

the personal and subjective unscrutinizable by others, and for which the individual is responsible only to his Creator and himself; and the general objective, tending to show man that his highest possibility of enjoyment lies in his capacity to do good to others, to contribute as much as he can to the welfare and contentment of those around him. This religious teaching is, after all, the most valuable for society at large, and the only one of real social import in our times.

As a matter of fact, the personal and subjective part, the direct influence of the dogma on the individual himself, previously considered the most important and only truly religious part, is to-day actually falling into the background, and has to be left to the care of the individual to work out his personal equation in this respect. This feature of the religious movement, clearly perceptible in the United States, represents the historical evolution of the different creeds, set alongside of each other on an equal footing. The dogmatic and doctrinal theological hatchet had to be buried, and Churches of all denominations were early brought round to exert a great social influence by striving more strenuously to maintain a certain ethical and moral

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

standard within their communities, rather than to hold them up to a doctrinal sapience. In fact, their attitude was very much akin to that of the good traditional English country curates, who were supposed to know more about the game of cricket and cross-country riding than the intricacies of the theological articles of faith, but who, for all that and possibly just on account of it, did the most meritorious work within their parishes, by energetically maintaining a true standard of manhood and uprightness, leaving the decisions of œcumenical councils nicely aside, and preaching the *Fair* and *Square* doctrine as the true principle by which to uphold self-respect and the right of equality among men. Further, the historical function of the Churches in the United States, as leaders and true organs of Public Opinion, ought to be remembered ; and the early activity of those Churches at the public meetings of the various local centres, expressing approval or condemning public individuals and their measures, and taking a practical and direct interest in the public doings of communities, was considerable. Depending on the goodwill and the prevailing notions or feelings in their congregations, the heads of the Churches were forced

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

to play the stump-orator and become the mouth-piece of the notions and ideas predominating among those congregations. They could not, indeed, well do otherwise, without impairing their chances of accomplishing the general good work before them, to which they had consecrated their existence and in the necessity of which they fully believed.

So much, then, for the rational direction and general social influence of the Churches. The very possibility of their exerting it depends upon the broadness of the views of the general ethical platform adopted by them. And now, a few words in regard to the spiritual proper, the dogmatic and doctrinary part of religion, aiming at the heavenly only, and leaving the terrestrial aside. In this respect, I well remember the remarks of a certain Rabbi Hirsh, of Chicago, in one of his sermons delivered in the windy city, which I happened to read incidentally. He began by stating that, according to the make-up of his organism, man could stand only a limited amount of suffering, bodily or mental, beyond which disorganization took place, either by death, or loss of reason. Thus, he continued, we used anæsthetics to bridge over crises of pain,

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

when under the surgeon's knife or acute suffering, and thanks to these anæsthetics we manage to preserve our life and reason. But what anæsthetics are to the body, religious beliefs are to the mind of man. They also help us to pass through difficult moments of our lives—crises, in fact, that otherwise would become fatal to us ; and herein their great value to humanity consists. "However," he continued, "no doctor would undertake to feed a healthy man on anæsthetics and opiates ; and just as little is that healthy man in need of mental opiates, to enable him to do his part of honest work in life. His spiritual food has to be different from the miraculous and supernatural creeds generally offered to him." And I confess that, according to my own limited views, the rabbi was right, as, eventually, a religion that unfits us for life instead of strengthening our possibilities to cope successfully with its problems and difficulties, is as much of a failure—from the point of view of self-preservation of the group—as any cultural development, ethically and æsthetically speculative, that has the same harmful tendency. To accomplish anything worth accomplishing, full vital energy is required, clear brains, strong personal convictions, and plenty of the

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

traditional maxillary development, not only in bone and muscle, but in personal character as well. A religion, therefore, that would soften all that, and would bring us down to speculate on the hereafter only, as the chief aim in life, would soon undermine our whole social structure, and render helpless the thousands and thousands who are fed as well as the thousands and thousands of the growing generation, who are provided for in advance, through the increase of national wealth.

A clear case is that of Jim, the terror of Texas, a leader of the cowboys in many a victorious struggle with the greasers, and others equally hateful to them, on whose monument the inscription is certainly characteristic: "Here lies Jim, the Terror of Texas. He did his damn'd level best, and the Angels in Heaven can't do any more." So, then, we either join the rabbi and start on the very serious errand of working out what the proper spiritual food for the healthy and active man should be, well conscious that we have to aim at the solidarity of the national group before anything else and not disregard its life interests for any foreign consideration whatsoever; or we have to prepare very

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

shortly to need the mental anæsthetic ourselves, when neglecting what from the profane point of view is our duty towards our kin. Otherwise we must put on our sackcloth, and wander to Canossa—the very place to which old Bismarck refused to go.

Before starting on the journey across the Alps, however, a look at the geographical map is advisable. There it is: but those nations which did not go to Canossa stand solidly on their own feet, and the general statistics of criminality among them are a great deal less high than among the others. It would almost appear, then, as if human brains were bound to reject the “*credo quia absurdum*” of the holy Augustine, in the interest of the preservation of the race.

Now, as to Moody's and Sankey's work in America, or that of General Booth in England. Our glorious civilization does not limit itself to creating the lofty international spheres I have already paid my compliments to, the American or other four hundred with their highly cultural motto, “*Après nous le déluge.*” As the artistic penumbra to the above, we have the great masses

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

of helpless de-humanized creatures in the background. They are hardly fit to live, and certainly unfit for serious work, and so much less capable of listening to cold reason, or to the highly moral address of a well-fed curate. Increasing in numbers and joined by some sturdy group of mutineers from the industrial ranks, these dark masses of our brethren are a direct and real danger to our very highly civilized institutions. It is their cause I have pleaded under the heading of the *Red Cross Brigades During Time of Peace*, starting from the very egotistical but at least sincere point of view of "the necessity of guaranteeing the safety of the whole," to which many ethical abstractions may be added. For the present, however, the fact suffices that such poor creatures have undeniably a ray of genuine sunlight in their inward emotional self given to them by a hymn of a Moody and Sankey or a meeting of the Salvation Army. So the question arises, which of the two religious exponents, a dean of some great cathedral addressing his illustrious audience in flowing, classical language, or Moody and Sankey singing their hymns with a crowd of miserables with sunken eyes and hollow cheeks, tottering limbs and weakened bodies,

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

and bringing that crowd to a point of real enthusiasm and a feeling of being really human—if but for a short time? Who would have done the more really religious work? I for my part vote for Moody and Sankey.

CHAPTER XV

COUNT XVI. reads: "American morality is puritanical in profession, but licentious in fact; marriages are but a form, and both men and women unchaste."

Evidently this is an anachronism, as I myself recollect many spasmodic moral fits in New York, making the poor uncultivated foreigner feel how eminently moral he had to become after his landing in Castle-Garden or Bedloes Island.

What other metropolis of the world, inhabited by nearly four millions of foreigners and only three-quarters of a million of pure native stock, could boast of an Anthony Comstock, for instance, generally known as "the holy Anthony," who laid legal embargo on beautifully executed albums of art reproducing the Dresden and Louvre picture Gallery, on the ground that such albums were immoral? Unhappily, the judge was not of the opinion of the holy Anthony and vacated the arrest. Comstock also arrested a whole edition of

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

Tolstoi's "Kreutzer Sonata" at the publishers' as being immoral. This was a splendid advertizing dodge of the publisher, executed in the best of styles, with the help of a friend who denounced the books to the president A. C. Then he made continual raids on various book stores for immoral books, etc.

Again, there occurred the terrible exterminating crusades against the public-houses, and the poor wretches in the streets, of course with the result that the plague was duly spread throughout the whole city, and then, indeed, became a real danger to public morality. This crusade was organized by an illustrious clergyman, the real re-incarnation of old Cotton Mather who burned witches in Boston.

All this glorious array of public moral work ought to be sufficient, I should say, to give a perfectly clean "dossier" of morality to New York, and to reflect beneficially on the moral tone of the whole American people. Why, there is more special legislation in the State of New York to create downright morality in the shortest time possible, than in any other world centre on earth. We simply beat them all to pieces !

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

The only trouble with that kind of Pecksniffiade is in its fatal consequences. It results in the deadening of the real moral sense, the sound morality without which no race can enjoy a healthy growth and development, by sacrificing it to mere outward appearances. It introduces the use of curtains, behind which *carte blanche* is customary, and increases the demoralization of the people. As a public measure it strengthens the power of the corrupt local bosses in politics, by giving them the chance to win the public by protecting it against the agents of the officially legalized censors of public morals. Moreover, it brings the legal institutions of the country into discredit, as, naturally, any such apparently legal piracy against the constitutional rights of the individual can but produce a rebellious feeling on his part.

However, happily for the country, Puritanism in this obnoxious form is neither popular nor authoritative. It is against the public taste, and therefore ephemeral. The whole of that moral pasquinade, put in glorious motion by the laurel-greedy dominie of New York, showed plainly that it was inspired by the letter and not the spirit of Puritanism. That letter has burned witches, ducked

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

women in the Charles river, made Rogers Williams fly to the Red Indians for safety, and been productive of sufficient intolerance and utter disregard of human rights to make Puritanism become a by-word denoting an extremely narrow gauge of thought and feeling throughout the civilized world.

But the spirit of Puritanism and, indeed, of Protestantism, saved civilization, built up the stronghold of the Anglo-Saxon race in England, and bred and reared a special race of earnest workers across the Pond, whose sixth sense is claimed to be gumption, and the national motto "Work," and to whom the world's civilization will surely owe something more important than mechanical engineering contrivances, if natural selection means more than mere vagaries. In truth, the real merit of Protestantism is not in the theological dogmas it evolved, nor in the various new rites of worship it introduced. In all these things, Rome, the true and best dispenser of the *Mental Anæsthetics*, is not to be beaten. Nor has Rome been equalled in its perfection of organization, not only of its body of ecclesiastical servants, but of charities and general humanitarian institutions. As good old Huxley puts it, it is Napoleon's

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

Guard pitted against a Yorkshire militia. Even the ritualistic part of Rome is laid out on a more really æsthetic and thoroughly artistic line, the Gregorian chant still remaining one of the greatest musical conceptions, and the *ensemble* being fully suffused with the quieting odour of incense.

No ! It is in the "Declaration of the Independence of Human Thought" that Protestantism scores ; in the assertion that a human being is a free-thinking creature, the child and not a mere abject slave of the Divine Power Who has created him. It is in the recognized liberty of the individual to try to do his level best with his brains as well as with his heart ; in his liberty to study, ponder, investigate and unravel, and at each step of his work, to perceive and discover the infinite greatness of the creative forces working within himself, as well as throughout his immediate surroundings, animate and inanimate ; in his right to trace the all-pervading, immutable and mathematically exact laws of this creation, and thus come to a clearer insight of his own position towards his Creator, as well as towards his fellow-men, and become really manly as well as religious ; it is in all this that the direct work of Protestantism is to

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

be seen. This is the proper spiritual food of the healthy man, busy with the very task the Almighty has assigned him on earth, providing, of course, that theology, by following the letter and not the spirit of Protestantism, does not imitate Rome in making merely the *mental anæsthetic* out of it.

However, Puritanism has its own historical characteristics, though it also is animated with the same rebellious spirit against the oppression and suppression of human thought, the spirit which is the chief feature of all the branches of Protestantism. Similarly to the others, Puritanism begins with personal introspection and meditation ; but, when brought into contact with public and state affairs the meditations of Puritanism cease to be entirely subjective. The Puritans see the decadence of feudalism before them, the institution so absolutely idealistic in its origin notwithstanding all its faults, and Puritanism is not averse to building up a system of individual training based on the strictest and almost cruel personal discipline of the knighthood of the mediæval ages, the discipline that made knighthood almost invincible in times past. Puritanism protests against

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

luxury, debauchery, profligacy, of any kind. It insists on simplicity, frugality, and stern discipline ; and by these very means gathers and stores human force, energy, and endurance within the race. Of this the lusty Cavaliers were absolutely careless ; but Puritanism enables that race, thus educated and bred, to accomplish its great work on both sides of the ocean. This, then, is the traditional group morality of the Puritan spirit : meditation and work ; simplicity of life and strict avoidance of excesses of all kinds ; self-control and command, as the first of all dogmas, coupled with real pertinacity in the task undertaken.

These are the dogmas that educated the highest type of man, even with the total absence of colleges. Narrowness and intolerance are but accessories. It is the mental and moral training of these men, their habit of meditation and reflection, their earnestness of disposition, that tell. Their notions of duty towards their fellow-men prevent the "Go to Hell" attitude, and bring group solidarity and public spirit to the fore. This is the opposite of the merely egoistical care for the heavenly welfare of "his own little soul," which is the keynote to the dispensers of Mental Anæsthetics,

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

who are so sure to dismember any national or social group.

Personal beliefs change according to our lights ; but the very habit of earnest dealing with matters of that kind is a part of group temperament, trained into it through generations and changing only after generations. Hence, the natural attitude of real and earnest Protestantism towards one of the chief issues of the day. It cannot but sympathize with and gladly receive the doctrine looming up among the scientists, that nature and its order are as rich and abundant a source of Divine revelation to man as the Bible or any other writing of men ; and that these revelations are bound to give us a real insight into what is our best way of regulating our existence, so as to be able to accomplish our utmost.

Confusing notions, however, are often encountered. From the scientific point of view, morals would mean all laws and regulations of our personal conduct, referring to the intercourse of man and woman, that would ensure the healthiest growth and the best physical development of our species. Ethics, starting from the same plane of thought, imply rules of social intercourse tending to the

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

highest development of the species as gregarious creatures. We cannot, therefore, avoid the necessity of broadening our views on the subject, if we want to arrive at sound conclusions concerning national aggregates, irrespective of longitude and latitude. Otherwise, though certainly justly preferring our own, we cannot venture to claim that the 50 millions of Japs are immoral, or the 150 millions of Russians are below par, or the 60 millions of Germans do not come up to the moral scratch, even if we leave the poor sick man of Europe and the total of over 300 millions of his co-religionists out of consideration. It is often said, that the many wives of the Jews were in those times a sociological necessity, even if they produced some family disturbances, as shown by the case of Sarah and Hagar, with poor Ab. in the middle ; but we do not hear the patriarchs accused of immorality. According to my views, this is not exactly fair to the Mormons.

National morality is not a *constant* but a *variable quantity*, depending to a great extent on the special conditions of existence the national group lives under. It is independent of even the number of illegitimate children encountered, but greatly

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

influenced by the diminishing statistics of births, when the number of such is only equal, or even inferior, to the deaths, as in that case the nation is bound to be overrun by the over-population of its neighbour, and finally cease to exist as a political power with a distinct national character. A single glance at the statistics, medical and others, of the United States, will show that, as a nation, the United States is eminently moral. Insurance averages and tables of measurement, etc., all point to a healthy improvement, rather than to a deterioration, of the population, besides the yearly increase of that population by nearly a million. As a nation, therefore, Americans are moral, and can also claim to preserve the true Puritanical spirit.

And now, in reference to the average individual encountered, is there more immorality met with in the States than elsewhere ?

I would very emphatically answer in the negative, supplementing my personal observations with the argument that there is more work done in the States than elsewhere, and that hard work is the most potent promoter of all kinds of moralities. City centres are, of course, city centres, and are

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

bound to supply their percentage of all kinds of human weaknesses and their results ; but comparing those in America with what is met with abroad, the utmost one could say about the Union at large would be that the proper use of *coulisse curtains* does not come up to the European mark. To come up to that mark diligent work and considerable waste of time are required, for which the American will probably not be ready, as the article itself hardly warrants the outlay, being questionable goods even at its best.

Now as to marriage and divorce.

Considering the absence of clans and their pressure, the indubitable fact that the American marries to suit himself and not others, and that the American marries generally the woman he loves, outside, of course, of the Mutual-Admiration-Association of the ladies and gentlemen where matrimonial speculations are in vogue in the home as well as in the foreign market, it becomes natural to suppose that all those social considerations that exert such a powerful influence in Europe should be found to play a far lesser *rôle* in America, and therefore that John and Jennie should sometimes part company, after having honestly found out that

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

the whole of it was nothing but a sad mistake, and, for all that, even remain good and trusty friends afterwards, irrespective of subsequent attempts on either or both sides to find consolation elsewhere. Incompatibility of temperament, duly testified to by both parties, will remain one of the cleanest and best reasons for divorce. On this ground it is already legal in Connecticut and a few other states, New York State excepted. For, after all, granting one to expect his or her share of life as his birthright and his due, in this wicked world of ours, without consideration of the rewards awaiting him or her on the other side of the black Styx after a life of sustained trial and suffering, then incompatibility of temperament will be found more than sufficient to spoil the very taste of existence for both. And why should they be made victims for life, for a deed the real character of which it was beyond their ken to ascertain? Society at large certainly derives a far greater benefit from the presence of the greatest number of fully satisfied and happy creatures in its ranks, than from the poor *miserables* that are sure to impart to others a good portion of the melancholy they are afflicted with themselves. To the full extent of

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

my personal study and observation relating to the matter, it would appear to me as if the very facility of parting company makes both parties more careful and considerate in their mutual relations, than when there is a legal indissolubility of the tie. In fact, this seems to explain why the Russian bear, performing in a public market-place, runs as fast as he can, when asked by his Tzigan master (gypsy)—“And how does a man go to his love?” but crawls very slowly indeed, when, continuing his see-saw, the Tzigan asks next: “And how does the man act when on the way to see his wife?”

But I must say that I have met with more genuine husband and wife lovers in America than in any other country. It was only in Germany that I learned about some family difficulties that might result from divorce. The case was that of one of the grandest women virtuosos on the piano I had ever heard, Mrs. Careno—she divorced Careno—and, taking her brood with her, subsequently married d’Albert, a musical composer of eminence, and certainly the greatest German expounder of Beethoven, on the piano (Lamont being a Scotchman). D’Albert was also a divorced man, and kept his

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

children at the time he married Madame Careno, by whom he also had children. For years, both artistes were busy with their professional work. They had their instruments placed at opposite sides of the flat, and spent most of their time practising, the nursery being situated in the middle. Once, hearing a terrible uproar in the nursery, Mrs. Careno ran quickly thither, and soon summoned the help of her husband with the characteristic complaint: "D'Albert," she cried in despair, "Come! *your* children and *my* children persist in annoying *our* children!" Well, that might be an exceptional case after all.

CHAPTER XVI

WE now arrive at the consideration of a group of criticisms which I have kept separate, as referring more to the æsthetic and ceremonial part of American life than to real traits of national character. Though fully aware of being heretical I put forward as axiomatic, for the consideration of the issues in question: That any genuine æsthetic conception ought to be reducible to notions of harmony, to uphold its claim of objectivity and general consideration, while harmony might be construed as the proper relation between the fitness of things and their purpose or aim. Beyond this clear line of demarcation, we face Liberty Hall apparently, with our personal right reserved of insisting on the genuineness of the article, irrespective of what it happens to stand for.

I have always been of the opinion that the drill in pure technique, generally accompanying the instruction in music, was destructive of natural musical taste and feeling, in the case of the average

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

poor creature wanting to get his share of musical enjoyment in life without aspiring to professional heights ; though, of course, such technique remains indispensable to the professional virtuoso intending to make public appearances his specialty. Equally have I found out that the French method of instruction in fencing has spoiled many a born fencer, and certainly has utterly disgusted most of the American boys with fencing ; that is, insisting on a full year of striking the proper attitude and pose on the rubber path, with the awful “ Advance ! En Garde ! Stretch ! Lounge ! Retreat ! ” and so forth, without end, not giving the poor advancing and retreating chap even the slightest chance of acquiring an inkling of what a set-to with weapons in hand means.

But the embryo musician is bound to derive real enjoyment out of his music when not squashed out of musical existence by the horrid technique drill ; and will soon have acquired sufficient technique incidentally to give a pleasant rendering to his musical thoughts. Likewise the boy who, instead of the “ Advance ! and Retreat ! ” is set to fighting early, while having his thrusts and movements corrected all the while, is bound soon

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

to acquire some special thrusts or cuts of his own, perhaps not classical, but effective enough to compel his teacher to pay attention to his own guard.

On the same basis I would claim greater latitude as to rules of æstheticism in our outward form. The classical may be all correct, probably is, when used by a maestro, but so long as the majority of us do not aspire to such sublime heights, having probably something else to be busy with in life, let there be somewhat more of a free interpretation of individual æsthetic feelings and propensities. If spontaneously genuine, they will be sure to pass the maestro's criticism.

I now "jump in the furrow," as the old Yankee farmer would say, and start with Count XVII. : "While professing to despise, the Americans secretly admire European and especially English aristocracy. They will pay anything for an English title, an English education, an English heirloom, or an English work of art. But they appreciate none of these things, except enviously."

In a country like the United States, built up by strong individuals rather than by masses, men who worked unsparingly for and with the masses of

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

people, and with the good of the country in view, the real value of the article man is certainly better appreciated than elsewhere. The public safety depends on individuals, as do commerce, money interests and business generally speaking, and the extraordinary political career of many men in the Union was certainly due more to their personal character and reliability than to their talents and ability. Moreover, in a country with such wide experience in breeding not merely animals but men as well, the value of a good strain of blood is certainly made more of than elsewhere, though, of course, a rigid distinction is made between "blood that tells" and "blood that has ceased to tell" and is merely discounting the ancestors. For that kind of article, even if backed by the Almanack of Gotha and the most authentic parchments, the United States is the worst of markets ; a great deal worse, indeed, than any European country, leaving out, of course, the matrimonial chances with the select ladies of the *élite*. The American will tell you that nature, and not the courts or men, makes the aristocrat, and from his point of view the American will certainly be right. The leader of men, the retainer of *the power of the few*, needs something more

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

potent than a mere handle to his name to carry his *rôle* through successfully, and doubtless many a terror of the borderland, beginning his career with a pick-axe in hand, or his political profession by entering the lower ranks of the organized masses, will be found far superior to many a titled individual kept in perfect order and correctness by his valet and his tailor. This the American knows, just as well as he knows from personal observation that exactly such "dudes" have often shown themselves real men of undaunted courage and strong upright characters when called upon. He also knows that some of them were post-graduates of the rough western school, like the famous Marquis de Mores, the French anti-Semite and successful cow-puncher in Dacota, Wyoming, or Bassompierre, and a whole list of English bloods, together with German nobility, all of whom went out west to the mines and ranches rather than strike matrimonial bargains among the willing members of the socially select mutual-admiration association of ladies and gentlemen. And again, our typical American John, the ultra-democratically busy fellow, is conscious of having tipped many Italian counts waiting on him at Delmonico's or Sherry's.

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

Evidently, then, the handle, without personality to back it, does not amount to much ; and the handle alone cannot serve as a guarantee of the qualifications needed to lead men or personify the power of the few. Though on an average, a bothersome over-sensitiveness and touchiness excepted, these chaps can be talked to with advantage ; and one might even pick up a thing or two in the way of valuable information from them. In the true etymological sense, however, that is, as leaders and men of the minority having the power, aristocracy hardly exists to-day. The remnants of it are only really found in England, where the law of primogeniture has held them above water as a class. It is not able to cope with the democratic forces coming up, the fellows that seem to possess all the backbone wanted, and who certainly know their constituents better ; who, besides, are able to strike smart political or other bargains, and possess the elasticity needed to squeeze through difficulties—all of which is beyond the ken of good old blood. In the social *mêlée* the latter no longer is the fittest, because of his rigidity of principle and lack of adaptability. Here, then, the “ Aristocrat made by nature ” is in the

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

van; and the minority at the helm has to be composed of the true representatives of the productive forces of the land; these and no others are the best *men of action*.

However, generally speaking, John knows the history of his own country pretty well, even if he is often in trouble about finding out which is which when it comes to some Continental records; for instance, the intrigues and troubles of the thirty and some States in Germany, or the grand Roi Soleil of France paying Protestant Swedes to fight the Catholics in Germany, and, at the same time, chasing his own best subjects, the Protestants, out of the country in the most barbarous way by the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. This, indeed, is too much for John. But in his own history he remembers that, when fighting against England, the American soldiers were drilled, disciplined, and led by many foreign noblemen, who volunteered into the fray, certainly not for money or profit. Foremost among these were the Marquis de la Fayette, Count Rochambeau, Kosciuszko, the famous Polish patriot, Count Pulawski, killed at the storm of Savannah, Georgia, and among another group of lesser luminaries, the famous Baron de

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

Kalb, who had learned his military profession under the Great Fritz himself, and who was considered by Washington as the very spirit of order and discipline in the American army. John smiles yet at the hot-tempered baron, who, when exercising his rough levy in Long Island, near the Brooklyn of to-day, was thrown into a regular state of frenzy by the awkwardness of his recruits. Having exhausted all his resources of German expletives (a very rich one, it is said), in "cussing" and swearing, and of a sudden seeing Lafayette approaching, de Kalb ran up to him excitedly, and supplicated him to *damn* these rascals in English, as his German proved unavailing, and he did not understand enough English to do it properly himself.

Evidently, concludes John, there are some fighting capacities in the breed, even if they are practically out of the race as politicians, and once more his own history gives him the account of the dudes of New York, who, though apparently weaker in build and lifting capacity, proved themselves far better soldiers than the heavy and robust fellows taken from the plough and the farms, during the struggle of the sixties. Then, again, it was the dudes of New York who were the best

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

fighters in the late Spanish war, and certainly their crack regiment, the Seventh (was not in war as a regiment) is the best drilled and most reliable in the State in case of internal troubles.

So John argues that those chaps, that is, such among them as have not gone to the dogs by softening of body and brains, are good war material after all, and certainly ought to be put on the committee of "National defence." This is their proper place, as in actual life, which means business, they are simply N.G. And John is right once more.

Still the query arises whether the defence of the country is limited to armed work against the outside enemy, or does not also imply the consolidation of a trusty guard, a body of public-spirited, reliable men, loyal to the Constitution and national interests as against the many foreign and native enemies of her institutions? John is extremely proud of his *American Institutions*, and very apt—especially in after dinner speeches—to refer to the country's judiciary as that "Guard of Honour" to whom the "Keep" of the Constitution has been entrusted, and who nobly remained at their posts regardless even of the voice of public opinion—that bugaboo, before whom John himself is somewhat disposed to

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

bow, without caring to investigate what it actually consists of, and merely on the general principle which finds expression proclaimed in the truism, "that it is not wise to monkey with the buzz saw."

However, all that the judiciary can accomplish is to adjudicate. The case has to be laid before them ; and John knows quite well that adjudication is often but a poor and expensive remedy, considering the harm that has then been done already, while an ounce of prevention is superior to a full pound of cure. He himself has always voted for the best man, whether that man belonged to his own party or not.

John knows all about the Congress, and the intimate working of the elective measures. He also knows how majorities can be created with the assistance of heaven, the dollar, and some energetic war-cries during the elections, arousing that sleepy animal, the public, to something like a general interest ; and more than once John has speculated on the great wisdom of the checks against the will of the majorities, provided for by the Constitution through the creation of a second chamber, and by giving to the President the right to nominate his own working cabinet of the Executive. He knows

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

very well that but for this the United States would have been in trouble and turmoil many a time ; and being a consequent and logical fellow, when seated on the Committee of " Ways and Means," he has often broken his head over the necessity of *special men* for the Higher House. Evidently the men there have to look at things from another point of view than the *men of action* of the Lower Chamber. They have to examine the bearing of things in their wider scope of consequences, going beyond the mere immediate interests and looking further into the far distant future ; a feature certainly outside the ken of the over-active up-to-date members of Congress. To be able to do that, however, they have to reach the conviction that *the dollar* is but a means, and not the chief aim in a man's life, a fact they could never suspect without being personally acquainted with the limits of the dollar's powers, limits which make him desire and strive for something higher.

Besides, John knows very well that all these things, desirable as they are, could not be acquired within the short space of only one generation, but would take several successive progenies of hard-working men, studying the records of various

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

experiences of public issues the whole world over in order to arrive at a wider and satisfactory notion about it all. And many a time when meditating over some spurious deals laid at the senatorial feet of his country, he has started swearing and damning in a very uncultured fashion, at the folly of Tom, Dick and Harry—his nearest acquaintances, all of whom were rich enough to buy out and out many a small European principality—in drilling their boys to business instead of sending them into politics, and, by so doing, achieving the security of the wealth amassed within the country.

Finally, John knew very well—a thing that has taken place since—that unless the best among the leading men of the United States would throw themselves into the political breach and clean the Augean stables of the accumulated political filth, severe ruin might threaten the whole of the commonwealth. And so it happened that John came to admire the English institutions, arriving at the idea that something akin would be a real necessity for his United States as well, and thoroughly ignoring in his *naïveté* how differently they had begun to look at the issue from the other side of the Pond.

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

Of course, he had many Hambletonian trotters, and Morgan or other runners in his stables, and had many a chance to swear at some of his promising colts who turned *sulkers* or *runaways* on the track. He was wont to curse them as "the damned degenerate aristocrats." But he now bought new batches of them willingly enough just the same, because he was far from being an exemplary moral man, and used to run races and bet heavily on his favourite nags, remaining steadfast in the opinion that "For a short and quick race, sir, give me a full blood : for endurance, good honest half blood."

All this, taken together, tends to demonstrate why the genuine American had some lurking weakness for the man with a handle to his name, though, of course, not without having tried the run of him, just as he tried his Hambletonian colts on the track ; and, though certainly it was nature and not man who made the aristocrat, it could not be denied that it was also nature who made his Hambletonians, and even the breed of his St. Bernard that had brought him several prizes and was fully worth a cool couple of thousand. All this was the work of nature of course. But :

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

“ Try him on the track first, so as to find out if he is not one of these *damned degenerates*, sir ! ”

So much for the true American feeling in this respect. It is genuine, and fully warranted. The readiness to pay for heirlooms can be easily explained by numerous family connections with the British isles. Not so long ago a Lord Fairfax kept a dairy farm in the vicinity of Washington, where he used to sell personally his high grade creamery butter from the pure-bred Alderney cows on his farm. Of course Fairfax was only a full-blooded lord, and not one of the select exquisites ! D. Campbell, a near relation to the Duke of Argyll, the head of the clan, practised corporation law and was a mighty good lawyer too. Count von Linden, one of the eldest strains of German nobility, ploughed his own acres and cradled his own grain himself, in the northern part of the New York State. He cradled it well enough to compete with the best of them in the neighbourhood. A Russian scion of nobility raised oranges in Florida, got almost brained by a mule, but survived, proving effectively the power of resistance of a pure blooded Russian skull. Count *Raousset de Boulbon* in times past gathered his army of cut-throats and went to conquer

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

Sonora from Mexico, and of course got shot for his pains. Another, descended from one of the oldest stocks of Lithuania, carried barrels of flour as a porter while he was studying English, and, while studying in the New York University, sold books in order to pay his way, and made quite a success in one of the learned professions afterwards. A number of decent men whom I knew personally, proved their possession of a strain of good blood, by preferring to start with hard manual labour which they were not used to, than to occupy the aristocratic position of the well-paid waiters at Delmonico's (one count married a customer of the establishment with millions of dowry) or to putting down their names in the matrimonial agencies for the titled.

The other part of the indictment, however, though equally true, cannot be charged to the same type of American.

A variety of very strange people sometimes travel abroad with a passport signed by the American Secretary of State ; and more diversified yet is the mass of those—hailing from the British isles as well—who take out their citizenship papers every year. They say of the Irishman that when,

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

on his landing in the old Castle Garden, he was approached by one of the political runners—we have them in New York just as well as the commonplace hotel runners, everything with us being duly and finely organized—and asked with whom he would cast his vote at the next election, he replied : “ Do not know much about these parties of yours, but you just put me down shtraight as voting agin the government.” This is a bye-shot of Pat’s humour only, as otherwise Pat is sure not only to vote with the government, but to be one with them in fact and that in a short time if he has any stuff in him. It is proverbial of New York city that the most eminent politicians as well as most of the dignitaries of the Church hail from the Emerald Isle. The canny Scot, too, sees many opportunities to hunt for the dollar, and he seldom misses a trick in doing it very successfully.

This is not generally the case with the English gentleman—I do not mean man. He very often joins the German sky-scraper, and is highly interested in the renovation of the world, so long as it can be accomplished without lowering the man to the *rôle* of the miserable slave of capital ; and in this new world of theirs there is no room left for the

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

hated and assuming House of Lords, or the like obstructions to the genuine progress of humanity and full equality of man. They generally ignore, or profess to do so, the very theme, once argued by Theodore Roosevelt, before the Nineteenth Century Club of Mr. Courtland Palmer: "That, in America, all men were born equal for the purpose of having full chances to become unequal, in due recognition of their personal abilities and work."

This, then, is the absolutely anti-aristocratic crowd of Americans duly and enthusiastically reinforced by the Semitic element; and, when looking at it analytically, there is nothing to astonish one in their hatred or envy, as, though having become gentlemen, they have failed to become full-fledged men, without which basis no genuine aristocrat can ever be produced by either nature or man.

CHAPTER XVII

Now that I am through with the essential points deserving serious consideration, the very emphatic but in reality minor shadings of the criticisms may be answered in a somewhat quicker tempo.

Count XIX. reads: "Their (meaning poor Uncle Sam's sons) national characteristics are those of weakness, being bully, bounce, brag, and bluster."

The contrary having been demonstrated as to national State affairs, the term "national" can apply only to typical traits encountered daily in the city centres, that modern arena of the so-called cultural struggle in the time of peace.

The social stratification and statistics as to the nationalities of the greatest of such centres, New York, having been given, I am ready on my part to admit that there is a generous display, frequently encountered, of bully, bounce, brag and bluster in our metropolis, especially in some centres of it well known to any American acquainted with his

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

New York. But I am far from considering either that the artistic display of such high qualities represents a sign of weakness, or that they are characteristically American in the sense in which I use that term in the present little volume.

Therefore, to be square to my critics, I am entirely ready to admit that there might be more of the bully, brag, bounce and bluster clustered together in New York, Chicago, St. Francisco, etc., in America, than elsewhere. And the reason for it is not difficult to find. It lies in that very atmosphere of freedom one cannot help being conscious of in any part of the great country, of which the effect is so much more visible near the Atlantic coast on account of the enormous masses of the foreign elements found there. The poor chaps are enjoying, probably for the first time in their lives, the privilege of giving free vent to their racial emotionalism and of displaying their mental traits and proclivities, without being immediately pounced upon by the official guardians, unless grievously transgressing the utmost limits of the allowable. No wonder, then, that native talent should be displayed *ad infinitum*. This, of course, is bound to make a strong impression on any foreign traveller,

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

familiar though he was with the national characteristics of all these people in their native homes. These qualities are thrust at him, say, in the good city of New York, in an artistic display of superlativity entirely new to him. Here, indeed, are the Germans more German, the French more typically French, and the Orientals from Russia, Poland, or Hungary, more characteristic, if possible, than the balance of their breed remaining at home. Their outer man may have undergone some change, but the very racial traits are displayed so much the more forcibly in the stimulating free existence of the United States. It is a fact that life in the States, with its strenuous activity and unavoidable necessity of keeping one's engine at continual high pressure, is more than apt to bring to the surface anything that is sticking within a fellow ; and it is certainly not the fault of the country that the thing found sticking is somewhat tinged with the unæsthetic propensities towards bounce and bluster, implying brag by construction and leading to bully as a logical sequence.

As it is, Uncle Sam has always been a school-master whose national methods were a great deal nearer to those of a Pestalozzi or a Herbert Spencer

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

than to the academically classic theories. Moreover, on the whole, Uncle Sam has clearly demonstrated the full superiority of his national pedagogics. By allowing the full display of the apparently uncultural traits of his new batches of foreign pupils Uncle Sam has only followed the example of his elder Cousin John Bull who, in absolute opposition to the Continental methods in dealing with the issue, has also allowed all political factions imaginable—revolutionary and otherwise—apparently to infect England, *de facto*, however, to spare his country their direct activity therein, as they well knew the value of a safe place of refuge.

But what England did in the political sphere the United States accomplished in the social. The original plan of Uncle Sam has always been to get the best materials to be found in the world, and to use such materials in building up a national community, based on a high average of the working and thinking capacity of its citizen, and this could be obtained only by allowing the greatest latitude of individual display.

A cultural discipline of the crowds is certainly a mightily agreeable thing. One meets it everywhere in Germany, especially in Prussia. I have

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

been greatly impressed by it myself, when seeing crowds numbering thousands deport themselves entirely correctly in the large beer-gardens, in the suburbs of Berlin, on Sundays. They drank their beer and coffee, ate their *wurst*, listened to the music, and enjoyed their Sunday rest outside the capital in the midst of their families and friends without one policeman on the spot apparently.

Being accustomed to carry a heavy cane and to keep myself in an effective physical condition to meet emergencies during the quarter of a century I have spent in the United States, the sight of these Germans impressed me sufficiently to make me investigate, and I found willing assistance in my *Wirth* and a police commissary of the place. Their explanation appeared clear and satisfactory to me. The bill one has to foot in Germany for a frivolous indulgence in a "Whoop her up, Gallagher" is so crushing for a poor man as effectively to secure the perfect respectability of his demeanour. There is his little book that he carries with him as a means of personal identification and legitimation. Therein are marked his place of birth, his occupation, and the standing of his parents; his own working contracts and discharges, signed by the employer

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

and countersigned by the authorities ; and also, fully enumerated, his conflicts with the authorities, if any—a mark which does not improve the fellow's chances to obtain employment, or in any way better his position in life. In fact, the authorities themselves keep a careful list of all those who come into disagreeable contact with them, and have such list continually at their disposal. They also fine you *three marks* for every transgression of any of the local regulations, whose number is infinite and which vary with almost every borough, but which you are supposed to be acquainted with.

For instance, in Grünau, in the vicinity of Berlin, your dog can promenade without muzzle ; but you need only pay your *zehn pfennig* for the ride across the river, and your dog has to have a muzzle on, or you are fined three marks, which you pay at once in return for the receipt of the official, should you have had the bad luck to meet that personage. You may explain to him that you are a stranger, that in Grünau the dog can perambulate without a muzzle, but it is a case of “ *No Go !* Pay or lose the dog ! ”

What there is left of a self-asserting individuality after being ground between the glorious official

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

on one side and a poor chap's hard struggle to eke out his existence on the other, is certainly not much, and it is no more than natural that he should seek his mass organization allowing him "to whoop her up" in the flock, and as one of a mass—generally with impunity, as he certainly cannot afford to risk doing so on his own account.

Of course, the query might be very justly put in connection with this issue, whether there is any inherent necessity whatsoever for the luxurious indulgence of the "whooping"? Here quite a conflict of authorities is encountered; but, belonging to the Uncle Sam school of pedagogics, I am rather in sympathy with the "whoopers." It surely represents extra spirit and force of vitality in man and beast, and true pedagogics with the statesman or the unassuming schoolmaster consist in the wise guidance of the extra energy thus encountered into the right channels of advantageous and useful activity, and not in destroying it or even subduing it. It is from extra efforts, calling for a superabundance of energy in man, that come all our productive improvements and gains, without which we should still be savages, irrespective of all

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

abstractions, as there would not have been any time left to cultivate such.

So, then, going on from the notion that the best protection for society is the free and broadest development of the individual himself, all tutelage by officials being excluded by the very idea of the "free for all," Uncle Sam practically says to his newly arrived pupils : " Go and bounce, brag, and bluster, as much as you like ; but take care, at the same time, not to come into contact with the policeman. That fellow's club is made of sound, solid locust, the night-stick is even loaded with lead, and it is wielded by an expert without the slightest consideration for the texture of your bone-tissue. And do not be silly enough to get into Sing-Sing or Auburn Places of Retirement, as there, again, you will not meet with too kind a treatment. Still, outside of that, you might just go ahead and find out what it brings you."

There is the whole story of it in a nutshell ; and the stupendous cheek displayed by many local politicians proves directly that there is plenty of market for good blustering. You will, also, be made aware in a very short time indeed that every shoeblack and without fail every vendor

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

of a handkerchief for 5 cents or a set of buttons for 10 c. is convinced that "they are the People"; and certainly there is hardly one speech made in the passably questionable democratic district, actually over-populated, without informing the constituents that they and nobody else "are the true People." And behind all that, the actual boss of the whole show, the genuine American, only smiles benignly. Yet, if anybody, he is the one emphatically to declare "We are the People"; and he generally has all means at hand to prove it. But, as a rule, that ambiguous personage leaves the talking to others, and attends to the *doing*. Being utterly non-committal himself, nothing suits him better than to hear the fellows around him brag and bluster. Knowing the exact length of his own tether, as well as that of the others, he does not even lose his temper. But when it comes to a game of poker, and he finds the stakes warrant the effort, he can bluff as well as any of them, remaining generally a winner. That capacity of his is well demonstrated on the Stock Exchange of New York; and it is a fact that few of the non-American elements are very anxious to meet him there, though certainly they do not lack either

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

money or bluffing capacity. What they lack is generally the Yankee's nerves.

Told in the true Yankee spirit, the answer to the criticism would sound: "Certainly, sir! we in the States have the best braggers, bouncers, blusterers, and bluffers in all creation. We cannot be beaten there; and, if you should happen to have some of the article to spare in your own country, just send them over. We will pay you the carriage for the genuine stuff, as there is plenty of call for it in the States. They are a lively set of fellows, sir, and prevent the torpidity of the national liver. Moreover, they are useful in teaching our own chaps how not to get flustered by a solid dose of bounce, which is a part of our practical education, sir."

CHAPTER XVIII

COUNT XX. reads: "American children are spoiled brats, mostly nervous, hysterical and ill-mannered."

Once more discrimination is called for. It is self-evident that the ideas of people as to the correct thing for their children will vary a great deal according to their social station, and more yet according to the old country associations of the new citizen of the United States. If a steward, butler, or stable-master, one who has in any way come into direct and frequent contact with the higher aristocratic spheres, the utmost outward correctness of demeanour is sure to be insisted upon. The poor fellow of a father will do his level best to bring out special shadings of extreme refinement in manners and speech, obvious tastes, peculiarities and gestures, all things which, he well remembers, he took untold pains to study and imitate, as soon as fortune smiled on him in the States, things, therefore, that are bound to become

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

cast-iron rules for him and his family, but which he himself abhors in his innermost soul, as he is sure to belong to the anti-aristocratic crowd of America. He will persist in spoiling the stomachs of his children by allowing naught but the whitest of bread, the most delicate of food and real delicacies to be dispensed at his board, just as he recollects his Lordship's table to have been served on festive occasions. This plan of living necessarily entails the unavoidable consequences, the calling in of the doctor, who will remonstrate against the family's way of living, if his medical studies have been directed towards familiarity with the body of man and its ailments, rather than towards psychology—a predilection certainly dangerous to the earthly welfare of a general practitioner among rich people.

“Why! sir,” will be the somewhat acerb rejoinder, “I am sure we do not go beyond a correct and decent limit; and you will not tell me that any one of us Americans here is not entitled to decent fare, as well as that famous nobility across the water. We can afford it a great deal better than they, I assure you, doctor.”

Moreover, under the direct supervision of correct tutors and governesses, who get almost double

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

pay from the anti-aristocratic gentleman on the ground of their having testimonials from their previous employers who happened to belong to the hated nobility, the poor children are squeezed into a strictly correct form and prescribed demureness of demeanour. It is true that, similarly to the Prussian subjects, the poor youngsters run eminent risk of being also squeezed out of their individuality. Sometimes, even, there will be open rebellion declared, especially when it is atavistically called forth by some strain of good Highland blood in the family. But, as a general rule, the article will be a success so far as manners go, though hardly a typical American article. Again, granting that such a new citizen of the United States happens to be a man with family traditions having some of the old English squire-blood in him, free from social restraint and clan pressure in the United States, he will try to do his best by his children, and proceed in exactly the opposite way from the former anti-aristocratic individual. Mannerism, ceremonials, and outward correctness are an old drug with him—he values them at their exact figure. He well knows that real manners are nothing but the outward expression

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

of delicate feelings within man, and that they are but a sham and a pretence when not in harmony with the emotional *inner self*. He is fully convinced that no real refinement can ever be taught or drilled, that it depends on the higher inner culture of the individual, so that a clean, healthy kernel will be his first and chief aim when bringing up his offspring. The life capacity of the child comes next, and by that he understands above all the creature's ability to stand up for its rights. A strong enduring physique would be his first care, and it is oats and porridge and the simplest of cooking that the young child will be brought up on, the delicacies allowed being generally a good supply of fruit and nuts. He will be more anxious about his boy's correct seat in the saddle than his proper way of perching on the light gilded Louis Quinze gimcracks in his wife's drawing-room, an accomplishment so emphatically insisted upon by Monsieur X, the authoritative *maître de danse* and deportment. He will be more exasperated by his boy's careless guard when boxing, than by his somewhat awkward manner of saluting the guests when entering the drawing-room. And, horror of horrors, though it often occurs in the United States,

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

he will be more proud of his offspring's winning any athletic contest than bringing home a reward for some extra achievement at studies, especially if such studies are classics, languages and—his chief antipathy—dramatic elocution, instead of mathematics and the exact sciences. He will find a workman's son a very proper and natural associate for his boy, so long as the fellow is straight, manly, and upright—even if his language should not prove all that could be desired; but he will have no patience with the boy's new acquaintances if they happen to be dudes and snobs. "His boy has to touch bottom when young," he will say; and touching bottom in the United States means an early mutual understanding with the healthy element of earnest workers from below, and not intercourse with the few varnished figures above.

So, then, the sons of that revolutionary squire will have but a very superficial acquaintance, if any, with the deportment and dancing masters, but will have taken plenty of lessons in the noble art of wrestling and self-defence from known semi-professionals, these gentlemen being none too correct themselves as a rule. Such a boy will look the very picture of health and strength, a real

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

pleasure to behold in a flannel shirt or rowing costume, but possibly ill at ease in a reception room, especially among ladies ; and the first type of American mentioned would decry him at once as a boorish, ill-mannered chap, absolutely neglected in his bringing up. What is more, such a father would also be tolerably indifferent as to his boy's progress at school, and would be equally careless whether the boy entered college or not, so long as the youngster was smart at figures and combinations, quick of understanding, and especially fully interested in all that surrounded him. In his business down town, the father has probably a good dozen, if not more, of college graduates, out of which he has been trying in vain to make something at least half-acceptable from the business point of view. But should the boy show any liking whatsoever for anything special, science, mechanics, or art even, the old gentleman is sure to give him all the help and assistance he can in enabling him to do something. Such a father's moral precepts will not be too many. In guiding his boy, very early and strenuously he will make him acquire the sense and personal feeling of *fair and square*. Half jocosely, half in earnest, he will often tell him

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

that " he is not the only pebble on the beach," and exhort him to be sure always to give the devil his due. He will frequently prove to the astonished youngster that there are always at least two sides to a question, and that every medal is bound to have two faces ; and will impress upon him that people ought to be judged and estimated according to their actions, rather than according to their beliefs or notions.

But he will make it clear that a liar and a turncoat or diplomatic sneak are about the lowest type of man he can encounter, and that there is no need to waste time in playing to a gallery of fools, or to bow before anything but honest personal conviction, if a man wants to pass through life satisfactorily and always to be able to look squarely in the face of his fellow-men. Being ready to do more than his own share of work, he is passably sure not to lack either bread or butter in exchange for it ; and, as to balance, he is certain to derive more real satisfaction from his own honest search after an understanding of the order of things, than from the applause or appreciation of the public. Once started on this very pet subject, our Americanized squire would be very apt to quote the tale, one of

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

the few he remembered from his own classical treadmill, how Alcibiades, the foremost man of Athens at that time, was once very painfully affected and wanted to know what new foolish act he might have committed, when his friends reported to him that the whole of Athens was full of enthusiastic praise of Alcibiades.

In a word, the chief traits of an American man would thus have been inculcated—a fellow who looks squarely and soberly in the face of things, and does not lose himself in any too great emotion about them, but, in some way or another, generally succeeds in keeping a perfectly level head through it all. The child becomes a man who believes in his country and its institutions, as representing one of the grandest schemes devised by man for the progress and healthy development of the race; a man who has more public spirit and genuine sense of duty towards his national group developed within him than the average citizen of any other country; who, therefore, cannot well separate his own activity in life and the interests of it from those of the whole group. At the same time, he claims his full rights of individual independence as to notions and ideas governing his personal existence

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

Although knowing life and its exigencies, he early accustoms himself to confine that innermost self of his within the smallest space possible, and as much as possible makes it independent of either the prevailing notions of his fellow-men or the vicissitudes of fortune. A few sympathetic souls intimately met suffice to dream with ; and all the rest is public service. Not dreams, but stern reality, must prevail, and matters must be dealt with according to the commands of a well calculated expediency.

Exactly in this lies the chief difference between the European and the real American dreamer of the higher type. It is not that the son of jolly Uncle Sam is devoid of dreaming and idealizing possibilities, or even of distinct propensities towards dream-land, but because up to now he has not freed himself—and let us hope never will—of the Puritanical spirit and training of the mind, according to the dictates of which “Life means Work and Duty,” conditioning the very possibility of the existence of all, while dreams and ideals are but personal luxury, and must necessarily give way before the general demands of reality representing common interests.

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

This then, when studied by the observant stranger, would easily enough lead to the terse criticism of Count XXI., stating that: "Jonathan, while very sentimental, is without bowels."

In fact, what else but his strong conviction gives the *sentimental bowels* to the European dreamer, conviction of the perfect righteousness of the constructive or even destructive speculations he is advocating in reference to the social or economic order of things, a conviction, in fact, that is easily traceable to an over-developed subjectivity—thoroughly foreign to an American—that has grown within the individual with utter disregard and total ignorance of the chief *objective* factors of the reality around him, though the very existence of the whole is found to depend on these very factors.

Let it suffice to recollect the important services rendered to the cultural interests of the world by America, as the permanent sociological laboratory where most of the present *isms* and even some embryos of future vagaries have never ceased to be experimented upon. Then, indeed, the issue will be clear before you.

Thus: Busy with his dollars and cents, his

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

factories and mines, his plantations and ranches, his railways and navigations inside the country, Uncle Sam, and not his Southern brother Jonathan, did not fail to take a lively interest in the new versions, ideas, schemes and work of the newly-landed Dutchman. (Not long ago everybody was a Dutchman in the United States, who was not born in the United States or England.) Uncle Sam went even further. He helped the Dutchman all he could, with the object of finding out for himself whether, after all, there would not be something worth picking up in all these new-fangled notions. Thus, he listened to Redpath preaching boycott on the sandhills of 'Frisco for the first time in the United States. He did not object to Herr Most levelling the earth with his *Zukunft Staat*, until that worthy began to drill his Socialistic battalions in the use of the gun and bayonet. Then, of course, he objected energetically, this being the right and privilege of the national guard and militia, who swore fealty to the Constitution of the land, and drilled in the country's interest and not against it. He also listened to Kropotkin, though he thought the noble prince to know very little about the things he said. His actual field

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

and speciality were the geology of the Baikal regions, and in the physiological studies of the phagocytes and leucocytes the Prince stood eminent indeed ; while any Oriental picked up in the street, east of Bowry, could have outdone him in talking about capital.

Struck with the idea of common education as the only true path to knowledge, wisdom and virtue, Uncle Sam spent millions and milliards for it throughout the whole of his domain. He has beaten Creation at it, giving every creature born, man or woman, a free education and the full capacity to get any title in any branch of study, at his (Uncle Sam's) expense. He has certainly welcomed the Brotherhood of Man, though, of course, by a mere prejudicial preference he would sooner have called an Englishman, a Scandinavian, or even a Dutchman his brother, than a Dago or a Greaser. But, knowing more about the subject than any European, he drew the colour line for the intended brotherhood.

All these issues were of so much more interest to him, as he enjoyed their consideration as a lark, as a recreation, so to say, after a hard day's work, because, being fresher in his subjective impressions

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

than the European, he would enter very seriously into the investigations of the subject before him.

But what were the results and conclusions reached by all these studies? He was obliged to declare Socialism and Boycott only dangerous nonsense for America. It created havoc and disturbance in the productive ranks of the country, without benefiting anybody, and least of all the very man of the rank and file whom it despoiled of his faculty of getting there. It artificially built up inimical groups of men among people whose friendly relations represented the first necessity in the country of successful productive activity, and it tended to make the famous proletarian remain proletarian his whole life long, become a kind of social pariah indeed, instead of "proletarian to-day, millionaire to-morrow," under the "Free for All" doctrine—the doctrine that has made the United States the most prosperous country of the world.

Education he found, similarly to Herbert Spencer, to consist not only in acquiring knowledge, which could be equally used for evil as well as good, but also in the formation of the character of man. This meant a new educational factor, of far greater importance in this automatic mechanical

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

age than a little smattering of knowledge. To his great astonishment, he found that it was nature rather than the colleges that made his best doctors, lawyers, scientists, literary men and musicians, as well as mechanics, inventors and even clergymen—all the men in fact who were doing things better and greater. He made some melancholy experiences with the highly cultured and seemingly refined, as well as with the prominently religious, and his police records showed him that the most distinguished swindlers and rascals who played their game in the United States were, as a rule, extremely refined in their exterior appearance and passed for being very religious. But the true backbone of the land, the men who made it in fact, and those who have pushed it along ever since, paying honestly its way and earning its subsistence, would have been considered white sparrows among the grey flock of the drawing-rooms, and would have found it to be anything but eminently religious. They kept their beliefs and notions on the subject to themselves as their most precious possession, and were the last to throw it promiscuously at the heads of the others or make a display of it.

Finally, Uncle Sam has been forced, through his

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

many close observations, to become a strong believer in heredity and in the strength of atavism. These discoveries led him to a laborious process of revaluation of the many European current standards, and made him a pronounced sceptic in many directions, more especially as regards those notions that generally begin with the time-honoured formula, "Thus spake Zarathustra," and do not have a direct connection with nature's order of life for a starting-point. No wonder, then, that his dealings with his own progeny should be highly unorthodox, and his æsthetic notions all askew, even though his select sons are sometimes fain to wear a chrysanthemum, if not a sunflower, in their button-holes. He has a few things he is sure of, the balance is with him in the hands of the fates, of which his apparent indifference to many issues is a natural consequence.

As to the children and youth. They are certainly at times even obfuscatingly different from the well-brought-up European type. They generally force their teacher to do hard mental work and head-breaking before he can manage them at all; but they give the most satisfactory results once he has won their confidence. Regulations and direct

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

peremptory orders are absolutely out of place there. But a good strong and square attitude, and especially the teacher's capacity to give good reasons why some study or work should be undertaken, are amply sufficient to command not only attention but good work as well on the part of the pupil. A teacher has to demonstrate to his class and convince them of the practical use of algebra, geometry, languages, or any other study, before he can expect any results of his work. A cool remark such as, "Do not make a fool of yourself, Fred," goes a great deal further, if properly made at the right moment, than a ten minutes' long, eloquent and moral allocution. Such lengthy appeals to the supposed higher sentiments are the best way of driving your young folks into rebellion, and destroy the very vestige of your possibility to accomplish anything with them. Outside of these few psychological traits, however, the average run of children is healthy and anything you please but hysterical or nervous; they would compare very well indeed with the average run of English hopefuls. Of course some Mammas are not to be lost sight of, especially among the rich people. Mammas, with house doctors and the like, are over-watchful in the

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

wrong direction, and would be just as likely to put a fifteen years old girl or boy in swaddling clothes as not. Mammas who want their darlings to be perfectly safe and secure from any hurt, danger, or contamination, are successful merely in producing all possible forms of distortion of a healthy child's nature by their so eminently sapient procedures. But then, such Mammas, as well as the *select ladies*, are once more an international product of our glorious civilization and cannot be said to be typically American.

CHAPTER XIX.

COUNTS XXII. and XXIII. read : “ Americans have no appreciation of personality. All are potentially equal, and consequently there is only insolence among the inferior. They bully negroes to vent their spleen for being bullied by Europeans.”

Then Count XXIV. : “ Americans are inhospitable.”

The previous treatment of the substance involved (*vide* Cap. VI.) makes further explanation superfluous. Mr. X., unassimilable elements, and the ephemeral product of international culture mentioned above, the snobs, are the only groups of men that could come under this accusation. Otherwise the American is just the man who appreciates personality in the fullest sense of the word, though—so much I am obliged to grant to the critic—the average American is more *sans façon* in his dealings with his fellow-men than is generally agreeable to most Europeans, accustomed as they are to other

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

proceedings. However, this is only a matter of externals. "Time is money," and the American's way of tackling directly any business proposition would simply prove that with him Cr. and Dr. are the only factors of consequence in business, the only ones, in fact, he is ready to consider, as all other things come under distinct headings and have nothing in common with business. But this does not prevent the American from being a very chummy and straight fellow, even if always bent on getting the best of a bargain.

It is true he will rather deal with anybody than a German from either Berlin or Frankfurt-am-Main, as he cannot bear their "fuss-making" as he calls it. But then, he is not the only one objecting to it, as I had a chance of witnessing when living in Bavaria for a number of years. One such incident was too characteristic not to be remembered. Disgusted with the eternal roast veal, and the international sauce of mysteries disguising all things served to you in most of the eating-places in München, I generally went to the breweries for my meals, where, at least, the local dishes were sure to be well prepared. Here I witnessed the follow-

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

ing scene on one occasion at one of the tables near to me. A sturdy typical Bavarian, evidently from the Bavarian upland, was seated there. He was attending to business, displaying full mental concentration and quite an expertness at it. He had ordered a *Kalbs-Haxerl* (knee-joint of a calf) with his beer, and had pulled out his finely sharpened dirk (a weapon customarily found in the hind pocket of every genuine "*Bajurware*"), to carve away the best bits of his national dish from the intricate joints of the large grilled bone before him. Looking at the earnestness of the chap, one could clearly perceive his full determination to do his level best with his *Haxerl*. Soon after, a new type made his appearance, saluting the Bavarian with his hat in the most approved style. He was somewhat flashy in his dress, but otherwise absolutely correct, except for a little pseudo-military stiffness that marked him at once as being originally a citizen of the German capital. He approached the Bavarian's table and, bowing once more, politely asked, "*Sie gestatten?*" while taking hold of the back of one of the chairs at the table designed for four. The Bavarian, fully preoccupied with his *Haxerl*, and working deftly the point of his dirk into the

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

joint, only looked up at the stranger full of real astonishment.

“*Sie gestatten?*” repeated the Berliner. Another chilling gaze was the only answer on the part of the Bavarian, who began to show some impatience, however.

“*Mein Namen ist X., Sie gestatten?*”

This proved too much for the equanimity of the honest native. He actually let his bone fall noisily on the plate, keeping the murderous dirk well in hand, and in full unmollified Bavarian he yelled out: “*Kruzi Himmel Sacrament! Was shere ich mich darum, ob Sie Miller oder Schulze heissen. So lassen Sie mich doch in Ruh mit meinem Haxerl. Der Tisch ist für viere. Na! also!*” (What do I care if you are called Miller or Schulze? Can’t you let me alone with my Haxerl? You can see that the table is meant for four.)

Here you have it in a nutshell. It is what the German would call a perfect “*Cultur-Bild.*” It faces you clearly and distinctly, and the query arises which of the two, the Bavarian or the Berliner, was most considerate of personality? In my own de-civilized way, I vote for the Bavarian, excepting the use of his dirk, of course, which might obfuscate

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

the æsthetic notions of some among us as being suggestive of danger to the user. I vote for my man, and declare the "*Mein Name ist Miller*" an intrusion, and but a parody of good manners. Moreover, it would almost appear as if I had many sympathizers in my Bavarian predilection, as that land appears to be the place in Germany most favoured by the Americans and even the English. You meet them there in crowds, and hear plenty of English as she is spoke in the very streets of München.

As to the trade mark of the common insolence among the inferior, it is certainly an international value, only perhaps more noticeable in America for reasons stated before. Heine gives us the key to the problem when he says :—

Selten habt Ihr mich verstanden,
Selten selbst verstand ich Euch,
Nur wenn Wir im Dreck Uns fanden
Dann verstanden Wir Uns ggleich:

And right he certainly is. Man remains man all over the wide world ; but it is only either in the lofty regions of human heights or in the primitive lower regions that man appears as he is without paint or whitewash, and that he faces his companion

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

in a simple natural way, in fact as man to man. In the middle track of our social course there is too much pre-occupation with the research of the proper level. Why should a man not take his seat directly, so long as he is entitled to it ?

Besides, the potential equality of all in America aims only at the equalization of chances at the start of the race, which is nothing but fair and square. But it remains only an equality as a potential, and does not chime in with the very marked inequalities actually encountered as the direct product of special efforts or even natural aptitudes.

The jolly darkey has been discussed already, and the bullying in America traced to its source and accounted for as a non-American feature. But the bullying of the American by the European is something new to me ; and I confess I never suspected it, having never witnessed it in the States or on the Continent. I have certainly heard many accusations against Americans of too much self-assertion or even too much of the national brag. But then, self-assertion is the Alpha and Omega of American life. Without it, a fellow had better select his favourite place of rest under the sod at once.

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

National brag is a trait possessed in common with the English cousin, and it would almost appear to be bad ethics on the part of the pot to accuse the kettle at the same hearth of being black. Besides, this is exactly one of the traits I have respected most in both cousins, my whole life long. Russia was also worth something so long as every Russian was sure of licking everybody else; and every nation is actually invincible only so long as it is convinced of its invincibility. National humility and cultural castigation show only national deterioration as soon as the notion becomes popular and begins to spread.

“Dem is my sentiments,” the old Yankee would say.

Now as to hospitality. Though a national trait, to a certain extent, the actual conditions of life have probably greater influence in that respect than they are generally credited with. Russia, especially in the South, was certainly in my time the most hospitable country of the world, a peasant’s hut as well as the mansions of the country nobility being always open to the stranger. With some of the jolly *Malorusy* it was customary to take off the wheels from the guest’s carriage, and lock them

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

safely in the storage houses of the estate ; and one was supposed to spend a goodly number of weeks, if not months, in the house of his host, roaming around, hunting, riding, and shooting, or studying in the well-furnished library if you liked it better. The expenses sheet of the steward showed a large allowance for the guests' oats in every estate. But behind it all, the dry but potential fact stood out clearly that the good people owning the estate spent whole months, very often, without the chance of talking intelligently on points akin to them, situated as they were outside civilized creation. No wonder, then, that the guest was a godsend.

The hospitality of the Arab and of the Tcherkiess in the Caucasus are equally renowned, and even among the most desperate cut-throats there, who are at war with the whole world, especially that part of it personified by the peaceable citizen of the surroundings, you are perfectly safe once you are under their roof, though, of course, the risk is imminent of being cross-questioned as to the direction of your intended journey, and then being way-laid, shot and despoiled on the road at a good distance from your place of rest, by

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

your previous host. Equally will you find the broadest hospitality in the sparsely settled parts of the woolly West.

As you near civilization, however, the picture changes, the dollar becomes eloquent, and you are apt to be looked at very suspiciously. Many indelicate personal questions will be asked of you before you are granted a shelter in a farmhouse, though you are ready to pay for it. In the south, you will yet find some remnants of the *Old Virginie* hospitality, especially in the States where the black population is thick—a fact which might be explained by the forced solidarity of the whites among them, and their necessity of mutual support to hold their own. But you certainly encounter the broadest, most generous and most enjoyable hospitality when invited by some gentleman to his country seat, though of course invitations do not occur without your passing previously a strict examination. This is a state of affairs easily understood, from what has been said under the heading of American society.

Under XXV. we find : “ Americans eat greedily and unhealthily. They drink to excess, and die of dyspepsia.”

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

The Americans who act thus have been already described. The reverse is the case with the others, who are more than particular on the subject of hygiene. Excepting young clerks, office boys, and other young hopefuls, who accomplish marvels in swallowing all kinds of cakes and tarts at luncheon-time, you will hardly find anything really resembling eating among the serious men of business at that time of day. The general custom is to take a glass of half cream and half milk with a slice of Graham bread for lunch, or toast and a soft boiled egg, or a baked apple, among well-known men of the street during business hours. Knowing well the value of an extra effort of the brain, they do not run the risk of impairing it by devoting a good part of their natural energy to digestion. A generous breakfast is the customary rule before leaving home, then very little, if anything, for lunch, and a full spread for dinner at home in the evening. Any drinking, and it is very little prevalent except at dinner and after dinner, is indulged in only outside of office and working hours.

If referring to the early seventies, the time of the standing bars, then indeed the critic is perfectly

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

right. A party of, say, six gentlemen would enter one of the drinking places with a standing bar, and no seating accommodation whatever. Of course, German fashion, each man paying for what he takes was contrary to American habits, so one paid for the round. The others would not be ready to consent without their chances to return the treat, the total result being six drinks in less than half an hour, and generally on an empty stomach, not a bite with it, and the very close atmosphere of the place full of alcoholic fumes. Refusing to drink meant insulting the others, which was not always safe or advisable. I personally once came very near being knifed on such an occasion, and that in the good city of New York, and in a very respectable place. I had politely but firmly refused the drink proffered me by some hot-tempered but otherwise probably very good-natured individual. He simply rushed at me with a huge carving knife, which he had snatched from the lunch counter. I measured distances very carefully, I recollect, intending to meet him with a classical *coup de savatte* I had picked up in Paris from a professional, when my would-be carver was deftly picked up off his feet from behind by the alert proprietor of the

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

place, his knife wrenched from his hand, and himself precipitated out of doors as quickly and forcibly as from a catapult, his hat being thrown after him. That proprietor, a Northerner from Bremen, had served on several vessels as mate. He had studied pharmacy and played the druggist for half a dozen years in the United States; had then invested in a saloon first, and a hotel next; and died worth a solid quarter of a million. Peace be to his ashes! I mention his history, so as to give a glimpse of the tricks of fortune on the other side of the herring pond. Well! all that is a matter of the past. Free lunches became the rule and the standing bars disappeared, proper seating accommodation being provided.

On the other side, the chief cause of dyspepsia, with alcoholism as the result and not the cause, has been the miserable cooking, which luckily is also an affair of the past. It was nobly taken in hand by enthusiasts, generally women, who soon had cooking schools added to most public school courses. Series of free lectures on hygiene and economic ways of living were started everywhere, while outdoor sport and gymnastics were put

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

within the reach of the poorer classes, and, in New York, several public squares of the east side are provided with outdoor gymnastic apparatus, which is seldom left idle by the street urchins.

CHAPTER XX

I NOW arrive at some most stupendous statements, actually more genuinely humorous than are many of the supposed humorous stories of one of the modern writers I have lately perused.

Namely : Count XXVI. : “ An American abroad is ashamed of his country. He likes nothing better than to be mistaken for an Englishman.”

Then XXVII., more monumental yet : “ The best Americans live in Europe.”

Of the first class of these Americans, I would say that they probably belong to a recent importation, having been Americans long enough to get hold of some American dollars besides the American passport, but certainly not long enough to grasp either the essence or the real signification of America as a country.

After having reached the dream of dreams, the legally indisputable possession of seven places in their figures of the mighty dollar, they expect to be duly salaamed by the public, and to their great

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

astonishment they find that neither the public nor the old minority of the land are ready to salaam them any more than the others, or to receive them with open arms into the many social Camorra circles of the land. With that small but really select and refined society group some pauper with a few extra ounces of brains is *de facto* considered a bigger man than he, Mr. Stein, Kranzo, or Feld. To such a creature America will appear the very embodiment of barbarism, a country of impudent fools, which, based as it is on nothing but the dollar, stupidly persists in not even respecting that dollar, the very power of which is unanimously and respectfully recognized by every waiter and hotel-keeper, and even by the official authorities throughout the whole of civilized Europe, as well as by the European nobility, at least by a goodly portion of it. No wonder, then, that weak human nature will make quite a distinguished traveller out of such an individual. He is at once feasted and even courted on the Continent, while "the stuck-up fools" at home persist in ignoring him socially, contending that he is vulgar, notwithstanding his money. As if he needed all that cultural trash so long as he has the money! They

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

certainly seem not to think so in Europe. On the contrary, he appears to be a perfect social success there.

Space does not allow me to enlarge upon this very amusing subject, so absolutely familiar to me. I would sooner emphasize my full meaning by a recollection of the famous Universal Exhibition of Paris in '67. The performing heroes were not Americans but Russians, but they also were money-bags and illustrate the chief features of mere money-bagism. They were types of the old Moscow merchants, historical fossils of a glorious commercial activity, belonging to the Staroviery (the Old Believers' sect). Our men—there were two of them—belonged to the first Merchant Guild of Russia, and their signatures could have been discounted at the Bank of the Russian Empire for fully a quarter of a million apiece. They went to see the Exhibition of the “perickmachers” (makers of wigs, the Russian nicknames for Frenchman) for a lark. The behaviour of the little Frenchmen did not suit them, since the Frenchmen all seemed wilfully to ignore the fact that they were no lesser personages than merchants of the first Guild in Moscow, whom even the Petersburg

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

authorities respected. And when they sat down to a spread in the elegant large hall of a first-class and very expensive hotel, and the other people at the table were served before them, their righteous indignation knew no bounds.

“*Waniooshka*,” said one of them to the other, “*Idiot po polam?*” (Vania, do you go half?)

“*Idiot*,” answered Vania.

The speaker jerked the cloth from the table, and the glass and china crashed to the floor. Instantly the waiter and the maître-d’hotel made to pounce on them, but were stopped by the calm demeanour of the offenders, who announced “We are merchants of the first Guild in Moscow! *Sko Iko?*” (How much?)

The alert business manager totalled up several thousand francs and presented the bill. The money was thrown down with an expression of disdain by the Starowier, who did not forget to add another thousand, calmly remarking, “*Eto dlia tiebia, Na wodka*.” (This for yourself, to pay for drinks.) Looking triumphantly around him on the by this time really awe-stricken Gauls, and perceiving a huge mirror reaching to the ceiling,

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

“ Vania,” he asked his friend, “ *Idiot po polam ?* ”

“ *Idiot bratietz.* ” And a well directed kick at the glass shivered it.

Of course a new bill in thousands was promptly paid, without forgetting the tip *Na Wodkoo* ; and then the merchants left the barbarous place fully satisfied. “ Well ! Vania, now these confounded wigmakers will know who is who, and what a Moscow First Guild Merchant is like ! ”

A couple of generations have almost passed since, and that glorious type of the old Muscovite is no more. The Oriental has displaced him even in the holy Moscow, where by law he would not have the right to reside, but where, nevertheless, he owns enormous interests at the present moment. Still the old trait of *Pokasatsa*, the French “ *Mon-trons-nous,* ” remains, and it is the trait paraded nowadays by the new-backed American millionaire. He puts his best foot forward, otherwise his cash, with this difference, however. While the associates of Vania have always been eminently national, proud of their country, even more than of their Guild, and ready quite voluntarily to sacrifice enormous means to assist the Government in difficult moments (Crimean War), there was the

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

racial blood in them of the old traders with the Hansa or others who, like the Strogonoffs, were real geniuses of enterprize, whose powerful economic aid contributed not a little to solidify the power of the Romanoffs, and to build up Russia. It was a Strogonoff who supplied that glorious scapegrace, the old Cossack Yermak, with means to escape the pursuit of the Government troops sent for his apprehension, and then gave him the opportunity to gather and equip his small troop of Cossacks for the venturesome expedition of conquering Siberia for holy Russia, adding to it a territory larger than the whole of Europe.

The case is widely different with the American millionaire. This type has no national propensities or ties. It belongs to the species of International Landsharks, whose ideals are strictly limited to cash and its possibilities, and who always seek pastures new, guided by their old motto, "*Ubi bene, ibi patria.*" Their chief trait remains the consciousness of the great "I Am," to satisfy the vanity of which even the precious cash is lavishly spent. Besides, their very fortunes were seldom the result of long and strenuous labour, as with the majority of the real Americans, but rather

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

the product of a lucky gamble or often the result of combinations none too ethical or æsthetical. This is one of the reasons why "the stuck-up fools" did not care to associate with them. Equally clear it is that all this could not have been accomplished without an extra elasticity of the spinal column. Swimming with the current is certainly an easier task than going against it. Such individuals are sure to bow before any prejudice as long as it is backed by some vestige of general opinion, and full of hatred against "the stuck-up fools" they will deny their adoptive country or their cradle even, and try to give themselves out as a clean John Bull article, forgetting the troubles of the bird with the borrowed plumes. But to accuse a real American of such transactions is not only unjust but ridiculous. A glance at his figure and features is enough to show you that you have a racial article in front of you. An insight into the fundamental principles on which that great Commonwealth has been established and developed is more than sufficient to enable one to recognize it at once as one of the greatest achievements of the Anglo-Saxon race, of which not only the American born but equally his cousin can be justly proud.

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

As to the gentlemen living abroad. With few exceptions, it would be as unfair to declare them the best Americans, as to claim, for instance, that the best fighting forces of England, or any other national army for that matter, are found on the retired list. Uncle Sam's domain is not a place of leisure or repose. His very scheme of nationalism implies public work, a never lagging interest in the affairs of his commonwealth. It is not and could not be based on blood ties only, as in other countries. In fact, America is too young a country to claim a distinct nationality on that basis only; Jamestown 1607, Plymouth Rock 1620, Duke of York 1664, if I am not mistaken. With these dates in hand, and ignoring even the fact that many millions found in the States to-day are of very recent and continuous importation, no serious ethnologist would claim that in 300 years a distinct strain of blood can be evolved to form a new racial nation. But it is self-evident that such a lapse of time is more than sufficient to form, build up, and develop a distinct commonwealth, drilled, disciplined and trained in special lines of work. In time, its inhabitants will acquire mental and bodily characteristics making them widely different from others,

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

though even then they will still be subject to atavism and to reversion to original racial traits. Americanism, therefore, in its true sense, implies a continued solidarity of the individual with the balance of his group, a community of interest with that group, not only material but intellectual and emotional as well, the readiness of the citizen to throw in his personal lot with that of the group of the United States, and earnest workers, helping them in forwarding the good of the whole in the common national direction.

This plan is broad and large enough to allow of the growth and application of all the possibilities within the individual, and ideal enough to animate any man of higher conceptions. Therefore, how an individual apparently shirking his national duty could be considered the best American is a mystery to me, unless I accept that, having been classically educated, he had at once started on the last educational grade of Herbert Spencer, that of the higher enjoyment of life, omitting the previous grade of social self-preservation, which would have identified him with his group and is so eminently American. Let us hope that the "short-cut" proved felicitous, and that by joining the numerous flock of the

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

humanitarian Internationalists some serious ethical foundation has been acquired by him.

But, where does Uncle Sam come in ?

The poor Uncle is eminently a man of work ; Public work, too, with a large P, and his national American education differs from that of most other countries in that he lays special stress on the thorough and complete course of the group self-preservation stage as going ahead of and conditioning the following speculations about the higher enjoyment of life. As an international affair, Rome is certainly ahead of the *Zukunft Staat*, and the pontifical decorations and titles are not so costly as those that can be obtained elsewhere.

Why, then, not go to Rome at once ?

CHAPTER XXI

WITH this, the last of the indictments against poor Uncle Sam are reached.

Count XXVIII: "America has produced no literature, art, music, architecture, poetry or drama."

Count XXIX: "American wit and humour are at the best only a trick of incongruous imagination."

Count XXX: "The Americans do not even speak English, but a sort of uncouth slang."

To answer XXVIII properly would be to copy out a voluminous list of standard works, beginning with those of Fenimore Cooper, Washington Irving, Emerson, Whitman, Hawthorne, Haggard, Crawford, etc., and discuss or rather prove the merits that no English-speaking man has ever denied—a task absolutely beyond my ken as well as my patience. Suffice it to say that the generality of real Americans, and I speak of the average man only, will be found a great deal more conversant

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

with what English thought has given to the world than the average Englishman himself. I have myself been very much surprised at finding, after careful inquiry, how little familiar the glorious Captain Marryat's books, on which I was brought up, are to English boys, and how few Englishmen, in a literary society if you please, were conversant with Charles Lever, whose works were sufficiently delightful to me to serve me as an hour's recreation in the midst of straining mental work. Equally stupefied was I, when reading the report of one of the library committees of one of the London districts, to find that the reason for discarding Lincoln's Life was because it was lacking in real refinement. The type was not found cultural enough. This tells a long story by itself, about the School Boards and Library Committees and *tutti frutti*.

Of the American humour there is no need to speak. Old "Sam Slick, the Clock-maker," Methody preacher and Shakespeare reciter, Artemus Ward and Mark Twain, are too precious a possession of the English-loving, feeling, and speaking people all over the world, to need a defence. I limit myself to mentioning Mr. Clemens' address

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

to the graduating young ladies of the Sarah Porter School in Farmington. He followed a bishop, several professors from the neighbouring Yale University, a whole galaxy in fact of big authorities on high morals and ethics. Unwilling at first, he gave in at last, as all de-civilized Americans are wont to do, when asked by ladies. "Well! young ladies," he said, "If I have to give you any advice of real benefit for your future I would say: Do not drink too much, do not smoke too much, and, do not marry too much." Now, it seems to me that Twain's advice could be well supplemented for the benefit of John Bull, by adding to it, "Do not civilize too much," as in this direction some real danger seems to lie.

As to the English language used in America, the popular medium is far ahead of its counterpart in England. Leaving the cockney and Londoners' Whitechapel as duly countered by the Bowery of New York, we face the undeniable fact that any Englishman, travelling the 3,000 miles from New York to San Francisco and the California coast, will be at fewer pains to understand and be understood, than an American journeying some couple of hundred miles or even

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

less in England, with its localisms changing with almost every county of the realm. As to the language written and read, there are certainly equally pronounced tendencies in both countries to injure it, at least for a time, by an affected mannerism. When Rudyard Kipling's famous "Soldiers Three" appeared in print, a true literary jewel that made all English-speaking people roar as heartily if not with more delight than d'Artagnan, Athos, Porthos, and Aramis of Dumas Père—I refer to Ortheris, Mulvaney and Learoyd, of course—I happened to be on my summer vacation in Farmington, Connecticut, and, full of enthusiasm, after having read the book sent me by a book-dealer, I jumped on my mustang and ran up to Charter Oak with it to my good acquaintances there. I had had one of the Warners in my care a few years before, so my enthusiasm was not of long duration, as Mr. Dudley Warner, the uncle of my pupil, had just condemned poor Kipling with all the severity and ire of one of the apostles of the purification of the English tongue. According to that gentleman, Rudyard Kipling was a vulgarizer of the English language. He himself had then written "Walks Around My Garden," which book was flaunted in

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

my face by a very decided type of literary lady as a model specimen of desirable English. I studied it very carefully and very unguardedly—I assure you I had to pay heavily for my views—I declared it to be “an emasculation of the English tongue.” This tendency towards the suave, lubricant, soft and delicate, continued nevertheless. We find it illustrated in Meredith’s “Diana of the Crossways,” for me the worst book Meredith ever wrote; and, say, Page with his “Under the Mistletoe” on the other side of the Atlantic, a book that has equally made me howl by its lack of genuine ring.

And herein lies the real danger. Here in England a schoolmaster, if you please, told me not long ago that Marryat was “too coarse,” while another one, a doctor—graduate of either Oxford or Cambridge—assured me my own vocabulary was teeming with obsolete words; that, for instance, the word “pitcher” was not good English, in fact, was never used, and that “jar” would be better English.

“Jar!” I protested, “Why! what will you do with the glass jars you put your preserves in?”

“Well! never mind,” was the reply, “it’s English just the same. Say pot or jug then.”

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

Of course I raised objections to the pot, but humbly submitted to the jug, out of mere courtesy, I assure you, as I should prefer a ewer if my poor American pitcher should come to grief in England, though even then I should have to turn teetotaller, for I can very vividly imagine a pitcher full of lager or mead—to be classic—but can hardly sympathize with a ewer filled with the same refreshing article. Space does not allow me to give further instances of this kind, though they are many. But, seriously, this mannerism, that will attempt next to expurgate King James's Bible and Shakespeare as being obsolete and not refined English, shows the presence of a virus of pseudo-culture threatening to submit the language that is the greatest in the world for its directness, terseness, brevity and virility to a process of docking that would make poor Will turn despairingly in his grave. The disease is as rampant here as in America, and would ultimately stop the healthy development of the English tongue by establishing an English Academy whose decrees would be binding as to whether a fellow might use the word pitcher or jug. This sacrifice of substance by diverting energy to hairsplitting as to form made poor

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

Pyrhon dictate his epitaph : “ *Ci gît Pyrhon, qui ne fut rien, pas même un Académicien.*”

This so-called classical tendency has already made a grievous inroad on the German tongue. It has begun to degermanize German and has introduced a Latinized form of composition foreign to the very spirit of the language, making the diction vapid, uniform, and absolutely devoid of the previously abundant possibility of the individual rendering of moods and dispositions. In fact, taking the writings of 50 years ago, Freytag, for instance, or Ebers, Spielhagen, or even a Hacklander, and comparing them with the modern school of the Impressionists, one is simply dumbfounded at the difference. For my part I stick to the old masters, even though I may be only a fossil. One could follow the mind and feelings as well as the notions and ideas of the writer behind, which certainly represents a good part of the enjoyment in reading him.

And so in English, Sterne's “ Tristram Shandy ” still remains my favourite there. I feel John Bull with his full national temperament and humour, while I trace but an imitation of d'Annunzio in Page, and that I cannot stand with equanimity, probably

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

because I have been unable to finish any of the books of the master himself. They simply rubbed me up the wrong way. In a word, I am ready any day to rush into the "Jungle," but refuse peremptorily to "Walk Around My Garden," even at the risk of being called uncivilized.

In architecture, skyscrapers satisfy me entirely. Not that anything approaching æstheticism could be claimed for the present structures in that line, but the steel frames used represent an epoch in architecture. This development is of American origin, and its full future possibilities are beyond our apprehension and so much less our application to-day. Only steel frames withstood the earthquake in San Francisco. Given a perfection of aeroplanes and further developments of wireless telegraphy and the telephone, we are not far from realizing a picture out of the "Coming Race" of that noble Briton, who certainly ought to be twice as popular in his own country as he seems to be—I mean Lord Bulwer Lytton.

As far as Art and Music are concerned, America undoubtedly abounds with native talent, some of them of great possibilities, though I grant that the artistic atmosphere that one finds so enjoyable in

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

Europe is as yet lacking. As it is, every poor beggar has to win his spurs abroad, before he can expect to be appreciated at home. Uncle Sam is too busy with other and more vital issues, to be able to devote himself to art earnestly, and he does not like to commit himself too much as to things he does not thoroughly understand. He knows that his cousin abroad has a leisured class well trained in that kind of thing ; and he prefers to hear John Bull's opinion on the work of any of his wayward sons who either make the air harmoniously vibrate or waste away their manly energy with paint and whitewash. This, of course, does not prevent him, in accordance with his national plan of education, from providing generously for the training of such individuals. The facilities offered in this direction in America are certainly satisfactory.

CHAPTER XXII

IN conclusion, then, the whole controversy simply leads us back to the difference in the educational programmes. Both cousins are of one and the same opinion so far as the Spencerian first grade, that of self-preservation and life capacity is concerned. They both devote more time, energy and money to the work in that direction than almost any other country on the globe. They do so on a perfectly scientific inductive basis of old Hellenism in its modern garb of hygiene and athletics, resulting in healthy natural morals in the personal conduct of the individual. But considerable diversity is encountered so soon as the second educational stage, that of social self-preservation of the individual, is reached. Here Uncle Sam is still sticking to his inductive, almost experimental, work with life and group experience for basis. He works strenuously at the solidification of his building material, and tinkers unceasingly at the complicated lines of the foundation. He attempts a gradual building up of his type, and is

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

satisfied with the usefulness of even the unfinished article, though his goal is as lofty as that of the others, namely, the highest development of the national type. In a word, he remains true on the whole to the Spencerian "from the Concrete to the Abstract."

John Bull's activity in that line is found to be rather deductive. After having historically developed his type of the perfect gentleman, a far more genuine article with him than with the others, even in the case of superficial culture only if the original material has not been destroyed by an overdose of soft soap—John Bull endeavours to train his sons up to the standard he has accepted nationally. Considering the homogeneity of the race, and, further, keeping well in mind that the immense colonial territories of the empire are absorbing and remunerate profusely the extra display of energy and venturesomeness of Albion's sons when they have too much vitality for *home use*, the plan of John Bull for the orderly regulation of his *At Home* cannot be said to be lacking in merits. It is certainly a beautiful home that he owns. I actually prefer it to the sunny France or Italy, notwithstanding its pesky climate.

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

But this does not prove that the inductive American method, accommodating itself as it does to the necessities of time and people, is not equally good, and so far as the future is concerned even more certain than the *At Home* regulations of John Bull. Both countries remain true to the old Anglo-Saxon spirit of individualism, and the welfare of both depends on the select minority at the head ; their men of action, elected from among the best of the land, and their men of thought, scanning the economic, political, and scientific horizons, guiding public opinion, and keeping it clear of the dangers of the demagogue. But in the bringing up of the future men of deed, as well as those of thought, America seems to me to have a real advantage, her "Free for All" and "best possible chances for all at the start," appearing to be the safest and most equitable means to make the best forces in the country available for her service. The work with the masses at large, their education and sanitation, calling for a real display of national energy as well as lavish expenditure, has enlisted the co-operation of the best brains in America. It is exactly here that the difference of principles and methods is most perceptible. In fact, while John

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

Bull, on principle, wants every pupil of his public schools to be gentlemanly, to acquire some higher notions of ethics and to remain under religious influence above anything else, which all tallies exactly with his national plan, Uncle Sam, on his part, chiefly aims at making the pupil of his own public schools fit to live, that is, capable of doing something and securing his subsistence, besides acquiring a comprehensive notion about the whole country and her public institutions. While John Bull, anxious about the correct behaviour of his scholars, increases the list of the regulation *Dont's* with every year, Uncle Sam works as hard as he can to eliminate the *Dont's* and substitute the *Do's* for them. While John Bull, again, in perfect harmony with the chief lines of his plan, does his best to inculcate reverence and order, Uncle Sam leaves reverence alone, and tries to make his disciple understand why order must be enforced in the most rigorous and unconditioned way and how much disorder would cost.

In a word, John Bull remains eminently religious, and Uncle Sam eminently secular. Religion is a personal affair outside his realm as a social teacher. He has given the utmost liberties and facilities to all

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

religions on earth ; but, as a teacher fitting a fellow for life, it is not the *hereafter*, but the *present* that is his object. He is responsible for the earthly, and not the heavenly, welfare of his pupil. Whilst traditions and high moral principles are brought forward to raise the national enthusiasm for "Britannia ruling the waves," everybody in the United States is expected to know why he should "stand for the United States." This is the thoroughly materialistic preliminary to awakening any feeling for the "Red, White and Blue" among the large masses of the population. And, uncultural as it may appear, it is the safest way after all. A hard tussle awaits every mother's child in his struggle for existence, and the very cultural influence, when prevailing from the outset, is certainly apt to soften rather than harden the fibre of the individual, incapacitating many for the tough encounters awaiting them. *Social self-preservation* does not mean the fitting and preparing for a pleasant intercourse with his fellow-men in life, but the identification of individual interests with those of the group, as one of the safest ways of promoting them.

It cannot be denied that, from the mere social

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

point of view, or in connection with the governing of the masses at large, J. B.'s programme is the more attractive. But, for that matter, the well-behaved German crowds near Berlin are far ahead of even John Bull's correctness, and at the same time far inferior when taken individually. In fact, attractive as the sight of well-behaved multitudes is, the principal point of consideration, the necessity of increasing the national potentiality of the mass material, ought not to be lost sight of, as well as the desirability of obtaining the largest number of types of great personal character and superior intellectual development. This very possibility is unhappily hampered, if not destroyed, by any mass drill regulations, be they school, social correctness, militarism, or even religion.

In truth, man and beast are found to be worth something only so far as there is stuff in them, the very thing which it is not in human power to give or create, but for the destruction of which we have devised various cultural institutions of eminent efficiency.

For my part I confess I have always been drawn to the greatest mischiefs on the school bench, and I can recollect quite a number of them who subse-

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

quently became great, strong men, in the true sense of the word, although at school they were in continual hot water and conflicts with the authorities, and deserved a leather medal of distinction rather than any other for their behaviour and work. And then, again, historically, it is the heretic, atheist, or agnostic that might be called the ideally religious man, as by refusing to swallow the whale with Jonah he proves to have taken matters sufficiently seriously to suffer persecution from his orthodox brethren—the strongest thesis of whom always was : “ He that is not with us is against us.” Besides, once the individuality within the average man of the community has become dormant or subdued by his discipline, the group itself is in a dangerous condition. It resembles the flock of sheep following its leading rams, in the right direction it is true ; but not at all securely, as it can be as easily led in the opposite destructive direction, by any set of other rams who happen to be more talented. Actually, it is, then, the sad case of that honest country curate in France who, being ordered to another duty by his bishop, was serving his last mass and preaching the parting sermon to his flock, when, suddenly carried away

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

by his feeling for them, he threw himself on his knees, addressing a fervid prayer to the Almighty on their behalf, and presented their case in the following sincere words: "*Seigneur, bêtes tu me les a donné, bêtes je Te les rends.*" This, of course, would be indifferent from the mere theological point of view, but very dangerous for the country when economic and political considerations are at stake. Moreover, the highest intellectual type of the land is sure to be a more secure and efficient quantity in the former than in the latter case. Conversant with the principal public demands, necessities and shortcomings, as well as with the resources and possibilities of the country, he will not lounge in the dangerous direction of the social and economic public benefactions on the mere strength of his own emotional convictions. The reality of things will be always sufficiently clear to him to counterbalance his personal gust of enthusiasm.

The absence of a codified standard, *as the only correct one*, will certainly produce many discrepancies and even some horrible heresies, when measured by European standards. But herein lies exactly the real source of life and strength of

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

thought, the real stimulus for honest individual work and the general broadening of men. I myself have been very agreeably surprised to find to what extent good Old Bob, otherwise Colonel Robert Ingersoll, was a familiar and sympathetic figure in London, atheist though he was called by the many theologians whom he in his turn dubbed the Apostles of human Discord, Darkness and Discontent. Old Bob, whom I knew personally for many a year, has certainly done more towards the awakening of a real humanitarian feeling of solidarity among the thousands of hearers listening to his public addresses than all the crowd of divines who persisted in denouncing him. His premisses were certainly simplicity itself, and his chief doctrine enunciated but the truism "that man derives his greatest enjoyment in this life by doing his level best to make the others happy." Old Bob strictly clung to the Spencerian Unknowable, and, as he affirmed, "he was ready to take the risk of the Hereafter, having done all he was able to Herein."

Actually, the writings of the modern American *Optimising Optimist* Trine prove by their remarkable popularity (over a quarter of a million copies

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

were printed and I have already seen a German translation) that, generally speaking, mankind is more than anxious to hear serious suggestions enabling the single individual to pass through his earthly existence in an "honestly enjoyable way without trespassing on the Unknowable."

But even outside the educational standard, which, after all, must vary according to the special needs of national centres, the moulding of Public Opinion must not be lost sight of. It is a power the importance of which is bound to increase daily as we advance on our national pilgrimage towards the higher and better. Indeed, Public Opinion is a double-edged sword that, under favourable circumstances, represents a real guarantee of public security for the country, but can equally be the source of national catastrophes when led astray. It stands to reason that the most careful work needs to be accomplished in this direction, safety lying in the unimpassioned, matter-of-fact examination of the pending issues in which *bona-fide* figures correctly put together decide, and where the eminent danger of the abstract notions, principles, and speculations with their due accompaniment of great emotional phrases and speeches leads to turmoil and perdition

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

by destroying the sturdy self-command of the group, which is as important as perfect power over himself is found to be for the individual. In this important direction, the larger the number of sheep the more dangerous the position of the national community ; and, as we have seen before, sheep flocks are the product of mass drills stifling individuality and thereby nullifying a man's constitutional right to discriminate. It does not matter whether such flocks of willing creatures are called into existence by a full fledged military drill master, the least dangerous after all, or by the apostle of civilized correctness or again by the one who preaches the higher creeds of international humanitarianism.

This is the present position of things : the first educational grade is common to both cousins, namely that regarding self-preservation. A strong discrepancy is encountered as regards the second. In facing the problem of harmonizing the so varied and almost antagonistic elements of his continually increasing ranks of citizens, and working up from below, Uncle Sam differs from his cousin across the sea in tackling the work of that grade, and by dint of assiduous work he succeeds in formu-

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

lating his own programme, which encourages instead of obstructing the full development of individuality, and also brings the quantity thus obtained into early touch with the commonweal, making it identify itself with the same, even if at the expense of some æsthetic externals

As regards the third and post-graduate course, that of the higher enjoyment of life, it is clear that John Bull is far ahead, providing, however, that his plan and type endure and prove capable of holding their own. Uncle Sam has but a few purely inductive generalizations to show in opposition to the completely worked-out scheme of John Bull. However, these are found to be revolutionary enough, and are too much the logical outcome of the work in the previous grades not to suggest the idea that the higher enjoyment of life coming out of the United States laboratory will not be greatly different from the European standard. The Doctrine of Work, as the chief ethical factor, is popular throughout the whole of the country and fully endorsed and adopted by its best men as "the sources of the greatest interest and enjoyment."

"Money as a means of individual initiative con-

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

cerning public affairs," is an ethical doctrine originating with the venerable Peter Cooper, and becoming more and more the creed of the real American millionaires, according to which doctrine large private fortunes are to be considered as national trusts to be used productively in the interests of the public at large.

Again, the new speculative direction has quite a number of adepts among the intelligence of the land, which implies "that every individual ought to be the maker of his own spiritual equation, with optimism rather than pessimism as a basis."

And, once more, the strict separation of public and business activity from one's intimate and private life underlies the general use and accepted regulations, leaving every man a law unto himself, building up his own retreat and making his own selection as to friends and modes of life.

These are some of the most pregnant features, gradually making their way to the social consciousness as distinct notions, serving as so many elementary principles of the American version about the *Higher Enjoyment of Life*, to be formulated more exactly at some future time.

Add to this the extreme activity in the applied

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

sciences and researches in all branches and directions, always duly supported by the most lavish private donations if necessary, and one has in earnest the Land of the Great Possibilities—the advance of which is almost too rapid for conscientious general record. It is bound to become the land of the most eminent specialists in most branches of human knowledge, as it already is in many. It certainly will also be the land of great, intellectually broad men, but whether it ever will have time enough to lead either in fashion or deep researches into the scholasticism of an Abelard or a St. Hieronymus remains a great question for me.

The human hive does not differ very much from the communities of our winged friends. When in search after honey, nations are also found to specialize, to acquire some capacities in which they excel, in producing things material or intellectual of use and benefit for humanity at large. And America's mission in the world's development seems to lie in the problem of evolving the genuine democratic type of the future, the independent man fully conscious of his personal duties as well as of all his individual rights, ready conscientiously

IN DEFENCE OF AMERICA

to fulfil the first in regard to his country and fellow-men, and equally prompt in defending his absolute freedom of individuality guaranteed to him by the Liberty Charter of his country, the American Constitution

PRINTED BY
THE LONDON AND NORWICH PRESS, LIMITED
LONDON AND NORWICH

DAUGHTERS OF ISHMAEL

BY

REGINALD WRIGHT KAUFFMAN

Crown 8vo. Cloth. 6s.

FRANK, DELICATE, SINCERE

In this book the Author has handled a difficult subject with the utmost of delicacy consistent with perfect frankness. While telling his story fearlessly, he does so without sensationalism. With nobility of manner and passionate sincerity he relates one of the sordid tragedies common to our great cities; but the story is told with such reserve and such impartiality that the zeal of the sociologist is never allowed to destroy the delicacy of the artist. Throughout the book there predominates the Greek idea of Fate; but there is also something better, the hope of the ultimate amelioration of the evils that the book so aptly describes.

London: STEPHEN SWIFT & CO., LTD., 10 John St., Adelphi

PRINTED BY
THE LONDON AND NORWICH PRESS, LIMITED
LONDON AND NORWICH

DAUGHTERS OF ISHMAEL

BY

REGINALD WRIGHT KAUFFMAN

Crown 8vo. Cloth. 6s.

FRANK, DELICATE, SINCERE

In this book the Author has handled a difficult subject with the utmost of delicacy consistent with perfect frankness. While telling his story fearlessly, he does so without sensationalism. With nobility of manner and passionate sincerity he relates one of the sordid tragedies common to our great cities; but the story is told with such reserve and such impartiality that the zeal of the sociologist is never allowed to destroy the delicacy of the artist. Throughout the book there predominates the Greek idea of Fate; but there is also something better, the hope of the ultimate amelioration of the evils that the book so aptly describes.

London: STEPHEN SWIFT & CO., LTD., 10 John St., Adelphi

THE WOMAN WITHOUT SIN

BY

PHARALL SMITH

Crown 8vo. 6s.

ORIGINAL AND UNCONVENTIONAL

The central idea of this novel is that in those cases in which the love of a man and a woman is sincere and genuine it is of necessity sinless, and consequently that they should be free to indulge it, the consequences being faced by the State. Original and full of force, this novel, containing as it does those elements of bigness so rare in these days, is a refreshing change to the ordinary run of fiction. With a pen which is as powerful as it is restrained, the writer attacks convention and upholds his own ideas of freedom between the sexes.

London: STEPHEN SWIFT & CO., LTD., 10 John St., Adelphi

THE REVOKE OF JEAN RAYMOND

BY

MAY FORD

Crown 8vo. Cloth. 6s.

INTERESTING, CULTURED, MODERN

This is an arresting story of the psychological development of a modern woman. The problem of marriage is presented at a new angle and treated with the touch of modernity. A character more interesting than Jean it would be difficult to find; cultured and broad-minded, a woman who has achieved mental and spiritual freedom by a vigorous search for the truth, she devoted her life to manifold practical activities in which her healthy nature found the utmost enjoyment. It was then that her tragedy befell her—a tragedy of temperaments—and the manner in which Jean revoked makes a strangely fascinating story.

London: STEPHEN SWIFT & CO., LTD., 10 John St., Adelphi

IN A GERMAN PENSION

BY

KATHERINE MANSFIELD

Crown 8vo. Cloth. 6s.

DELIGHTFUL LITERARY NOVELTY

Never before have Germans, from a social standpoint, been written about with so much insight, or their manners and habits described with such malicious naiveté and minute skill. Miss Mansfield's power of detailed observation is shown in numerous little touches of character painting which enable us to realise almost as visibly as the authoress herself, the heart, mind, and soul of the quaint Bavarian people. The occasional cynicism and satiric strokes serve to heighten but not to distort the general effect. The one or two chapters which might be called Bavarian short stories rather than sketches are written in a most uncommon—indeed thoroughly individual—vein, both in form and substance. Miss Mansfield's style is almost French in its clearness, and her descriptions will remind the reader of Russian masters like Turguenieff.

London : STEPHEN SWIFT & CO., LTD., 10 John St., Adelphi

AN ENGLISHMAN IN NEW YORK

BY
JUVENAL

Crown 8vo. 5s. net

VIVID ORIGINALITY

In these notes and studies on life in New York, Juvenal, by his vivid originality and his masterly deductions, has surpassed all other writers who have written on the same subject.

Mr Eden Phillpotts writes of the Author: "The things seen are brilliantly set down. He writes with great force and skill."

London: STEPHEN SWIFT & CO., LTD., 10 John St., Adelphi

THREE EXCELLENT WORKS OF FICTION

1. "*Clever Characterisation.*"
2. "*A Prodigy of Age.*"
3. "*Unique Comedy.*"

I SOME NEIGHBOURS

BY
CHARLES
GRANVILLE

STORIES, SKETCHES, AND STUDIES
2nd Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.

"A pleasant book . . . prettily conceived and told. . . ."—*The Times*.

"The stories are always interesting, both as studies of odd aspects of humanity and for the curious modern reticence of their art."—*The Scotsman*.

"'Some Neighbours' deserves the highest commendation."—CLEMENT K. SHORTER in *The Sphere*.

"The treatment is invariably fresh and individual . . . thoroughly readable."—*The Morning Leader*.

2 THE RECTOR OF ST JACOB'S

BY
ARTHUR
RANSOM

A NOVEL OF PHENOMENAL
INTEREST

Crown 8vo. 6s.

"... Could only have been written by one who knows the outs and ins of the latest ecclesiastical controversy. Our wonder is heightened when we learn that it is the first book of one who will shortly enter his eightieth year."—*Westminster Gazette*.

"We can recommend this book to all who are interested in religious differences."—*English Review*.

"It has life and power."—*Observer*.

3 THE MAIDS' COMEDY

A CHIVALRIC ROMANCE
IN THIRTEEN CHAPTERS

Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net

"The Author of this highly entertaining, and indeed delicious, 'Chivalric Romance' does not give us his name, but we trust that he will be encouraged to give us more stories in the same delicious and fantastic vein."—*Daily Telegraph*.

London: STEPHEN SWIFT & CO., LTD., 10 John St., Adelphi

COMPANIONS IN MERIT

1. "Excellent Irony."
2. "A Fine Play."
3. "Irresistible Satire."

I

TRIUMPHANT VULGARITY

BY
CHARLES J.
WHITBY, M.D.

A WARNING TO DREAMERS

Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net

"Even if he did not happen to be endowed with a forceful and dignified literary style and a distinct if rather acrid sense of humour, Dr Whitby would have made good his claim to a place apart from the ordinary run of disgruntled Jeremiahs."—*Daily Mail*.

"We have read few books on similar or kindred themes with such a sane and level-headed treatment."—*Academy*.

2

CIVIL WAR

BY
ASHLEY
DUKES

A PLAY IN FOUR ACTS

Crown 8vo. 2s. net

"A play of unusual merit."—*Manchester Guardian*.

"The characterisation is excellent, the dialogue appropriate and easy."—*Daily Express*.

3

SIR EDWARD

BY A FELLOW
OF THE LITERARY
SOCIETY

A BRIEF MEMORIAL OF A
NOBLE LIFE

1s. net

"The Author has earned our gratitude for this whimsical study."—*Spectator*.

"A very pretty piece of satire."—*Observer*.

"A most polished essay."—*Morning Leader*.

"We have still a few humourists left and one of them is Sir Edward."—*Scotsman*.

"One of the drollest satires of the day."—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

London: STEPHEN SWIFT & CO., LTD., 10 John St., Adelphi

TWO BOOKS

BY

FRANCIS GRIERSON

A Profound Thinker and Delightful Stylist

THE CELTIC TEMPERAMENT

And Other Essays

Third Edition. 2s. 6d.

"I place these essays among the most subtle and substantial that I know."
—MAURICE MAETERLINCK.

"I find the 'Celtic Temperament' charming and full of wisdom. The essay that has happened to strike me most is the one on 'Hebraic Inspiration.' The pages of 'Reflections' also have found their mark in me."—Prof. WILLIAM JAMES.

"Mr Grierson gives us original and intimate *aperçus* of things . . . subtle things, and, as I say, 'intimate'—things deep down below the surface of conventional thought—and Mr Grierson's book is full of them. . . . I shall keep Mr Grierson's book on the same shelf as 'Wisdom and Destiny,' and 'The Treasure of the Humble.'"—A. B. WALKLEY.

PARISIAN PORTRAITS

2s. 6d. net

The Times says:—"He not only recalls what is the most valuable essential of every real memory, the atmosphere, the emotional outlook, the general effect, but has also retained the harvest of a busy, critical and very alert eye. . . . He aims at giving an edge to all he says. . . . His touch is light and easy, his insight sure and his choice of subject exclusive. . . . A finished, skilful, and richly-laden book."

Daily Express.—"Amazingly clear and acute."

Westminster Gazette.—"Living memories of famous people made unusually real by Mr Grierson's vivacious art of writing and his premeditated frankness."

London: STEPHEN SWIFT & CO., LTD., 10 John St., Adelphi



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
BERKELEY

**THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW**

Books not returned on time are subject to a fine of 50c per volume after the third day overdue, increasing to \$1.00 per volume after the sixth day. Books not in demand may be renewed if application is made before expiration of loan period.

AUG 29 1918

SEP 30 1921

FEB 1 1967 1 5

REC'D

MAR 11

REC'D LD

MAR 11 '67 -1 PM

~~YB 36760~~

YB 36765

E168
.T2

252443

